arXiv:1008.4728v1 [math.AP] 27 Aug 2010

ALLARD TYPE BOUNDARY REGULARITY THEOREM FOR VARIFOLDS WITH $C^{1,\alpha}$ BOUNDARY

THEODORA BOURNI

Abstract. In this paper we show that Allard's boundary regularity theorem for general varifolds [All75] can be generalized in the case of $C^{1,\alpha}$ boundaries, (Theorem 3.14); in [All75] it is required that the boundary is $C^{1,1}$. The proof presented here is along the lines of the proof of Allard's interior regularity theorem [All72] found in [Sim83]. In particular we give the proof in the case of a rectifiable varifold. In this way, as in [Sim83], we simplify the notation and the computations needed for the proof, without however weakening the original hypotheses in Allard's paper [All75], because of the rectifiability theorem (cf. [Sim83, Theorem 32.1]).

1. Notation and Preliminaries

Let B be a $C^{1,\alpha}$ closed $(k-1)$-dimensional submanifold of $\mathbb{R}^n$ passing through the origin, with $k<n$ and $0<\alpha\leq 1$. Then there exists a non-negative constant κ and radius $R>0$ with $\kappa R^\alpha<1$ such that

1.1
$$\begin{gathered}|\operatorname{proj}_{\mathbb{N}_b B}(y-b)|\leq \kappa|y-b|^{1+\alpha}\\ \|\operatorname{proj}_{\mathbb{N}_y B}-\operatorname{proj}_{\mathbb{N}_b B}\|\leq\kappa|y-b|^\alpha\end{gathered}$$

for all $y,b\in B\cap B_R(0)$.

We use the notation T_xB for the tangent space of B at x, N_xB for the normal space of B at x and $\operatorname{proj}_{T_xB}$, $\operatorname{proj}_{N_xB}$ for the projections onto the two spaces respectively. Finally, $B_r(x)\subset\mathbb{R}^n$ will denote the n-dimensional ball of radius r centered at $x\in\mathbb{R}^n$ and for any $m\in\mathbb{N}$, ω_m will denote the m-dimensional area of the open unit ball centered at the origin in $\mathbb{R}^m$.

Remark 1.2. *Since $\kappa R^\alpha<1$, for any $x\in B$ and $r>0$ such that $B_r(x)\subset B_R(0)$, $B\cap B_r(x)$ is the graph of a $C^{1,\alpha}$ function above T_xB, i.e*

$$B\cap B_r(x)=\operatorname{graph}\psi_x\cap B_r(x)$$

where

$$\psi_x: B_r(x)\cap T_xB\to N_xB$$

is a $C^{1,\alpha}$ function such that

$$\frac{\|\psi_x\|_0}{r}+\|D\psi_x\|_0+r^\alpha[D\psi_x]_\alpha\leq\kappa.$$

Definition 1.3. *For any $x\in B_R(0)$, we define $\rho(x)$ to be the distance of x from B and $\bar{x}$ will denote a point on B such that $|x-\bar{x}|=\rho(x)$. (Note that there is not necessary a unique such point $\bar{x}$).*

Under the above assumptions it is easy to check that the following inequalities hold

Remark 1.4. *Let* $x \in B_{R/4}(0) \setminus B$ *and* $y \in B_{\rho(x)/2}(x)$*. Then*

$$|\operatorname{proj}_{N_{\bar{x}}B}(y-\bar{x}) - (y-\bar{y})| \leq c\kappa\rho(y)^{1+\alpha}$$

and

$$|\rho(x)D\rho(x) - (x-\bar{x})| \leq c\kappa\rho(x)^{1+\alpha}$$

for some absolute constant c*.*

We consider a rectifiable k-varifold, $V = (M, \theta)$, where M is a countably k-rectifiable, $\mathcal{H}^k$-measurable subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ and θ a locally $\mathcal{H}^k$-integrable function on M and we let $\mu_V = \mathcal{H}^k \llcorner \theta$ be the weight measure of V (cf. [Sim83, Chapter 4]). For V we assume that it satisfies the following 3 properties, which we will denote by P_1-P_3:

- P_1 $0 \in \operatorname{spt} V$, $\mu_V(B) = 0$.
- P_2 $\theta(x) = \Theta_V(x) \geq 1$ for μ_V- almost every $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$.
- P_3 There exist constants $a \geq 0$, $q < \frac{k}{k-1}$, such that

  $$\delta V(X) \leq a\left(\int_{B_R(0)} |X|^q d\mu_V\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}$$

  whenever X is a smooth vector field with compact support in $B_R(0) \setminus B$ and where $\delta V(X)$ denotes the first variation of V with respect to X i.e.

  $$\delta V(X) = \int_{B_R(0)} \operatorname{div}_M X d\mu_V.$$

Notice that property P_3 implies the following, which we will denote by P_3':

- P_3' There exists a μ_V-measurable function $H : B_R(0) \setminus B \to \mathbb{R}^n$ with $|H(x)| = D_{\mu_V}\|\delta V\|(x)$ (where $\|\delta V\|$ is the total variation of δV, cf. [All72, Chapter 4]) for all $x \in B_R(0) \setminus B$ such that

  $$\delta V(X) = \int_{B_R(0)} X \cdot H d\mu_V$$

  for any smooth vector field X with compact support in $B_R(0)$ and such that $X(y) = 0$ for all $y \in B$. For H we also have that

  $$\left(\int_{B_R(0)\setminus B} |H|^p d\mu_V\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq a$$

  where $p > k$ is such that $\frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{p} = 1$.

Remark 1.5. *By the definition of a k-rectifiable varifold and Rademacher's theorem (cf.* [Sim83, Theorem 5.2]*), the function* $\rho(x) = \operatorname{dist}(x, B)$ *is a* μ_V*-almost everywhere* C^1 *function on* M *and therefore* $\nabla\rho = \nabla^M\rho$ *is well defined.*

Throughout this paper the letter c will denote a constant which possibly depends on the given variables n, k, p, α. When different constants appear in the course of a proof we will keep the same letter c unless the constant depends on some different parameters.

2. First Variation and Monotonicity

Throughout this section we assume that B, V are as defined above, i.e. they satisfy 1.1 and properties P_1-P_3 (and hence P_3') and we let $U = B_{R/4}(0)$.

Lemma 2.1 (First Variation Formula)**.** *For any smooth vector field X with compact support in U:*

$$\delta V(X) = \int_{U\setminus B} X \cdot H d\mu_V + \int_B X \cdot \eta dV_{sing} \tag{1}$$

where $\eta = \eta(y) \in N_y B$ for all $y \in B$.

Proof. We will first prove that V has locally bounded variation in U, i.e. we will show that for any $W \subset\subset U$ there exists a constant c (depending on W) such that

$$\delta V(X) \leq c \sup_U |X| \tag{2}$$

for any smooth vector field X with support in W.

For any smooth function $\phi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ we can write $\delta V(X)$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\delta V(X) = &\int_U \operatorname{div}_M[(1-\phi(\rho))X] d\mu_V + \int_U \phi'(\rho)\nabla\rho \cdot X d\mu_V \\ &+ \int_U \phi(\rho) \operatorname{div}_M X d\mu_V.\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

Let $\{\phi_h\}_{0<h<1}$ be a family of smooth functions such that

$$\phi_h(\rho) = \begin{cases} 1 \text{ for } \rho \leq h/2 \\ 0 \text{ for } \rho \geq h \end{cases}, \phi_h'(\rho) \leq 0$$

and such that $\phi_h \overset{h\to 0}{\longrightarrow} \chi_{(-\infty,0]}$, the indicator function of $(-\infty, 0]$. Then, by property P_3'

$$\int_U \operatorname{div}_M[(1-\phi_h(\rho))X] d\mu_V = \int_U (1-\phi_h(\rho)) X \cdot H d\mu_V \overset{h\to 0}{\longrightarrow} \int_{U\setminus B} X \cdot H d\mu_V$$

and by property P_1

$$\int_U \phi_h(\rho) \operatorname{div}_M X d\mu_V \overset{h\to 0}{\longrightarrow} 0.$$

Hence, by using (3) with $\phi = \phi_h$ and letting $h \to 0$, we have that (2) is equivalent to

$$\lim_{h\to 0} \frac{1}{h} \int_{T_h} \nabla\rho \cdot X d\mu_V \leq c \sup_U |X| \tag{4}$$

where $T_h = \{x : \rho(x) < h\}$. Therefore for proving that V has locally bounded variation in U it suffices to show that for any $W \subset\subset U$ there exists a constant c (depending on W) such that

$$\lim_{h\to 0} \frac{1}{h} \int_{T_h} \chi d\mu_V \leq c \tag{5}$$

where χ is a smooth function such that $\chi = 1$ on W, $0 \leq \chi \leq 1$ and with compact support in U.

Let $\mathcal{W}$ be a Whitney partition of $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B$ (cf. [KP99]). Then

$$B_R(0) \setminus B \subset \cup_{\mathbb{C}\in\mathcal{W}} \mathbb{C}$$

where the elements $\mathbb{C}$ of the collection $\mathcal{W}$ are cubes with the following property: If $\rho_{\mathbb{C}} = \operatorname{dist}(\mathbb{C}, B)$, then $\rho_{\mathbb{C}} > 0$ and

$$\operatorname{diam} \mathbb{C} \leq \rho_{\mathbb{C}} \leq 3 \operatorname{diam} \mathbb{C}.$$

For each $\mathbb{C} \in \mathcal{W}$, we let $x_{\mathbb{C}} \in \mathbb{C}$ be the center of the cube $\mathbb{C}$ and $y_{\mathbb{C}} \in B$ be such that $|x_{\mathbb{C}} - y_{\mathbb{C}}| = \rho(x_{\mathbb{C}})$. Finally let $\phi_{\mathbb{C}}$ be a partition of unity suboordinate to the covering $\mathcal{W}$ and such that

$$|D\phi_{\mathbb{C}}(x)| \leq C\rho(x)^{-1} \tag{6}$$

where C is an absolute constant.

Given $\chi : U \to \mathbb{R}$ a smooth, non negative function with compact support we define the vector field

$$X(x) = \sum_{\mathbb{C} \in \mathcal{W}} \phi_{\mathbb{C}}(x)\psi(\rho(x))\chi(x)X_{\mathbb{C}}(x). \tag{7}$$

where $\psi : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ is a smooth non negative function and for each $\mathbb{C} \in \mathcal{W}$, $X_{\mathbb{C}}$ is defined by

$$X_{\mathbb{C}}(x) = \operatorname{proj}_{N_{y_{\mathbb{C}}} B}(x - y_{\mathbb{C}}). \tag{8}$$

X is then a smooth vector field that vanishes on B and thus by property P_3'

$$\delta V(X) = \int_U \operatorname{div}_M X d\mu_V = \int_U X \cdot H d\mu_V. \tag{9}$$

By Remark 1.4, for any $x \in \mathbb{C}$

$$X_{\mathbb{C}}(x) = \rho D\rho + Y_{\mathbb{C}}(x) \text{ , with } Y_{\mathbb{C}} \text{ satisfying } |Y_{\mathbb{C}}(x)| \leq c\kappa\rho(x)^{1+\alpha}. \tag{10}$$

Furthermore

$$\operatorname{div}_M X_{\mathbb{C}} = \operatorname{trace}(\mathbf{e}(x) D X_{\mathbb{C}}) \geq 1$$

where $\mathbf{e}(x)$ denotes the matrix of the projection onto T_xM and $DX_{\mathbb{C}}$ is the matrix of the projection onto $N_{y_{\mathbb{C}}}B$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{div}_M X &= \sum_{\mathbb{C} \in \mathcal{W}} \operatorname{div}_M (\phi_{\mathbb{C}}\psi(\rho)\chi X_{\mathbb{C}}) \\ &\geq \sum_{\mathbb{C} \in \mathcal{W}} \phi_{\mathbb{C}}\chi(\psi(\rho) + \rho\psi'(\rho)) + \sum_{\mathbb{C} \in \mathcal{W}} \phi_{\mathbb{C}}\chi\psi'(\rho)\left(\nabla\rho \cdot Y_{\mathbb{C}} - \rho|\nabla^{\perp}\rho|^2\right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{\mathbb{C} \in \mathcal{W}} \phi_{\mathbb{C}}\psi(\rho)\left(\rho\nabla\chi \cdot D\rho + \nabla\chi \cdot Y_{\mathbb{C}}\right) + \sum_{\mathbb{C} \in \mathcal{W}} \psi(\rho)\chi\nabla\phi_{\mathbb{C}} \cdot X_{\mathbb{C}}. \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

We introduce the quantities

$$Y = \sum_{\mathbb{C} \in \mathcal{W}} \phi_{\mathbb{C}} Y_{\mathbb{C}} \ \ , \ \ g = \sum_{\mathbb{C} \in \mathcal{W}} \nabla\phi_{\mathbb{C}} \cdot X_{\mathbb{C}}$$

for which, by (10) and Remark 1.4 we have the following estimates:

$$|Y(x)| \leq c\kappa\rho(x)^{1+\alpha} \tag{12}$$

and

$$|g(x)| = \sum_{\mathbb{C} \in \mathcal{W}} \nabla\phi_{\mathbb{C}}(x) \cdot (X_{\mathbb{C}}(x) - (x - \bar{x})) \leq c\kappa\rho^{\alpha}. \tag{13}$$

Substituting for the quantities Y and g, inequality (11) now reads

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{div}_M X \geq& \chi(\psi(\rho)+\rho\psi'(\rho))+\chi\psi'(\rho)\nabla\rho\cdot Y-\chi\psi'(\rho)\rho|\nabla^\perp\rho|^2\\ &+\psi(\rho)\nabla\chi\cdot(\rho D\rho+Y)+\psi(\rho)\chi g.\end{aligned}$$

Applying this inequality in (9) we get:

$$\begin{aligned}\int_U \chi(\psi(\rho)+\rho\psi'(\rho))d\mu_V \leq& \int_U \chi\psi(\rho)\rho D\rho\cdot H d\mu_V+\int_U \chi\psi(\rho)Y\cdot H d\mu_V\\ &-\int_U \psi(\rho)\chi g d\mu_V-\int_U \psi(\rho)\nabla\chi(\rho D\rho+Y)\\ &-\int_U \chi\psi'(\rho)\nabla\rho\cdot Y d\mu_V+\int_U \chi\psi'(\rho)\rho|\nabla^\perp\rho|^2 d\mu_V.\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

Let $\gamma:\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}$ be a smooth function such that

$$\gamma(t)=\begin{cases}1 \text{ for } t\leq 1/2\\ 0 \text{ for } t\geq 1\end{cases}, \gamma'(t)\leq 0\ \ \forall t.$$

Then we can use (14) with $\psi(\rho)=\gamma(\frac{\rho}{r})$ (for some $r>0$). Since

$$\rho\psi'(\rho)=\frac{\rho}{r}\gamma'\left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)=-r\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\left(\gamma\left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)\right)$$

and because of the estimates for Y and g (given in (12), (13)) this gives

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_U \chi\left((1-c\kappa r^\alpha)\gamma\left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)-(1+c\kappa r^\alpha)r\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\left(\gamma\left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)\right)\right)d\mu_V\\ &\leq\int_U \gamma\left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)\chi\rho D\rho\cdot H d\mu_V+\int_U\gamma\left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)\chi Y\cdot H d\mu_V\\ &\quad-\int_U\gamma\left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)\nabla\chi(\rho D\rho+Y)d\mu_V-\int_U\chi r\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\left(\gamma\left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)\right)|\nabla^\perp\rho|^2 d\mu_V.\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

Let r be such that $1-2c\kappa r^\alpha>0$ and set $\Gamma=2c\kappa\alpha^{-1}$, where c is the constant appearing on the LHS of (15). Note that

$$\frac{e^{\Gamma r^\alpha}}{r}\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\left(\gamma\left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)\right)-e^{\Gamma r^\alpha}\frac{1-2c\kappa r^\alpha}{r^2}\gamma\left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)=\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\left(\frac{e^{\Gamma r^\alpha}}{r}\gamma\left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)\right).$$

Hence after multiplying (15) by $-(1+c\kappa r^\alpha)^{-1}e^{\Gamma r^\alpha}r^{-2}$ we get

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\left(\frac{e^{\Gamma r^\alpha}}{r}\int_U\chi\gamma\left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)d\mu_V\right)\\ &\geq-\frac{e^{\Gamma r^\alpha}}{r^2}\int_U\gamma\left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)\chi\rho|H|d\mu_V-\frac{e^{\Gamma r^\alpha}}{r^2}\int_U\gamma\left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)\chi|Y||H|d\mu_V\\ &\quad-\frac{e^{\Gamma r^\alpha}}{r^2}\int_U\gamma\left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)|\nabla\chi|(\rho+|Y|)d\mu_V+\frac{1}{2r}\int_U\chi\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\left(\gamma\left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)\right)|\nabla^\perp\rho|^2 d\mu_V.\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

Letting γ increase to the indicator function of $(-\infty,1)$ and integrating (16) from σ to r, where $0<\sigma<r$, we get the following **monotonicity inequality for**

tubular neighborhoods of B:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{e^{\Gamma\sigma^\alpha}}{\sigma}\int_{T_\sigma}\chi d\mu_V \leq &\frac{e^{\Gamma r^\alpha}}{r}\int_{T_r}\chi d\mu_V\\ &+e^{\Gamma r^\alpha}\int_{T_r}\chi|H|d\mu_V+e^{\Gamma r^\alpha}\int_{T_r}\chi\frac{1}{\rho}|Y||H|d\mu_V\\ &+e^{\Gamma r^\alpha}\int_{T_r}|D\chi|\left(1+\frac{1}{\rho}|Y|\right)d\mu_V-\frac{1}{2}\int_{T_r\setminus T_\sigma}\chi\frac{1}{\rho}|\nabla^\perp\rho|^2d\mu_V\end{aligned}\tag{17}$$

Note that the last term on the RHS of (17) is negative so it can be dropped. The other terms, because of the estimate for Y (cf. (12)) and the fact that H is in L^p (cf. P_3'), are bounded. Hence we can let $\sigma\to 0$ and this gives

$$\lim_{h\to 0}\frac{1}{h}\int_{T_h}\chi d\mu_V\leq c\tag{18}$$

where the constant c depends on κ,α,a,W. This proves (2), i.e. that V is of bounded variation or equivalently that $\|\delta V\|$ is a Radon measure. This implies that for any vector field X with compact support in U we have that

$$\delta V(X)=\int_{U\setminus B}X\cdot Hd\mu_V+\int_B X\cdot\eta dV_{\mathrm{sing}}$$

where

$$\int_B X\cdot\eta dV_{\mathrm{sing}}=\lim_{h\to 0}\frac{1}{h}\int_{T_h}X\cdot\nabla\rho d\mu_V\tag{19}$$

(cf. (3), (4)).

We finally want to prove that $\eta=\eta(y)\in N_yB$, for all $y\in B$.

Let X be a vector field with compact support in U and such that $X(x)\in T_{\bar{x}}B$, $\forall x\in U$, $|X|\leq 1$, where $\bar{x}$ is as in Definition 1.3. Using Remark 1.4 and the fact that $x-\bar{x}\in N_{\bar{x}}B$ we have

$$|X\cdot\nabla\rho|^2\leq 2\left|X\cdot\left(D\rho-\frac{x-\bar{x}}{\rho}\right)\right|^2+2|X\cdot\nabla^\perp\rho|^2\leq c\kappa^2\rho^{2\alpha}+2|\nabla^\perp\rho|^2$$

and so

$$\frac{1}{h}\int_{T_h}X\cdot\nabla\rho d\mu_V\leq\left(\frac{1}{h}\int_{T_h\cap\operatorname{spt}X}d\mu_V\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\int_{T_h\cap\operatorname{spt}X}\frac{2|\nabla^\perp\rho|^2}{\rho}+c\rho^{2\alpha-1}d\mu_V\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Using the monotonicity inequality (17) and the fact that V is of bounded variation (in particular inequality (18)) we have that for any χ with compact support

$$\int_{T_r}\chi\frac{|\nabla^\perp\rho|^2}{\rho}d\mu_V<\infty$$

hence

$$\lim_{h\to 0}\frac{1}{h}\int_{T_h}X\cdot\nabla\rho d\mu_V=0.$$

Because of (19) this implies that $X(y)\cdot\eta(y)=0,\forall y\in B$ and so $\eta(y)\in N_yB$, for all $y\in B$. □

We would like to derive now a monotonicity formula for the ratios

$$r^{-k}m(r) := \frac{1}{r^k}\mu_V\left(B_r(b)\right)$$

where b is a given point on $B\cap U$ and $r>0$ is such that $B_r(b)\subset U$. Such estimates can be found for example in [All75, HS79, DS93b, DS93a, Bro77]. However, for completeness, we provide the formulas that will be needed for the proof of the main boundary regularity theorem, Theorem 3.14.

Having established the first variation formula, Lemma 2.1, we can use it with the vector field

$$X(x)=\phi(d(x))(x-b)$$

where $d(x)=|x-b|$ and $\phi:\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}$ is a smooth function with compact support in $[0,R/4-|b|)$. Then we can argue as in the interior case (i.e. when $B_r(b)\cap B=\emptyset$, cf. [Sim83, §17]) and by letting ϕ approach the indicator function of $B_r(b)$, where $0<r<R/4-|b|$ we get the following **monotonicity identity**:

2.2
$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dr}\left(r^{-k}\mu_V(B_r(b))\right) =&\frac{d}{dr}\int_{B_r(b)}\frac{|\nabla^\perp d|^2}{d^k}d\mu_V + r^{-k-1}\int_{B_r(b)}(x-b)\cdot H d\mu_V\\ &+ r^{-k-1}\int_{B\cap B_r(b)}(x-b)\cdot\eta(x)dV_{\text{sing}}.\end{aligned}$$

Recall that $\eta(x)\in N_xB$ for all $x\in B\cap U$ and so, using 1.1, we can bound the last term by

$$\left|\int_{B\cap B_r(b)}(x-b)\cdot\eta(x)dV_{\text{sing}}\right|\le\kappa r^{1+\alpha}\|V_{\text{sing}}\|(B_r(b)).$$

We now want to estimate $\|V_{\text{sing}}(B_r(b))\|$.

In the proof of the first variation formula we have shown that this singular measure is equal to a limit of integration along tubular neighborhoods of B (equation (19) in the proof of Lemma 2.1). Hence using the monotonicity inequality for tubular neighborhoods ((17) in the proof of Lemma 2.1) with χ approaching the characteristic function of $B_r(b)$, $\sigma\to 0$ and replacing the initial ball $B_R(0)$ with a smaller ball $B_{R'}(0)$ if necessary (with R' depending only on α,κ, so that the terms $e^{\Gamma r^\alpha}$ and $|Y|$ appearing in the monotonicity inequality are sufficiently small), we get the following estimate of the singular measure in terms of $m(r)$

2.3
$$\|V_{\text{sing}}(B_r(b))\|\le\frac{2}{r}m(r)+4am(r)^{\frac{1}{q}}+4m'(r).$$

Using the notation

$$\bar{m}(r):=r^{-k}m(r)$$

we have that

2.4
$$\|V_{\text{sing}}(B_r(b))\|\le(2+4k)r^{k-1}\bar{m}(r)+4ar^{\frac{k}{q}}\bar{m}(r)^{\frac{1}{q}}+4r^k\bar{m}'(r).$$

Lemma 2.5. *There exists a function $\Phi(r)$ and a constant $\Lambda=\Lambda(k,p,\alpha)$ such that for $r<R/4$*

(1)
$$e^{\Phi(r)}\bar{m}(r)^{\frac{1}{p}}+\Lambda r^{1-\frac{k}{p}}$$

is an increasing function of r.

In particular

$$\Phi(r) = \frac{4k+2}{p\alpha}\kappa r^{\alpha}\ ,\ \Lambda = \frac{a}{p-k}\exp\left(\frac{4k+2}{pa}\right).$$

Proof. By using the estimate for the singular measure 2.4 in the monotonicity identity 2.2 we get the following

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{m}'(r) \geq \frac{d}{dr}\int_{B_r(b)}\frac{|\nabla^{\perp}d|^2}{d^k}d\mu_V - (1+4\kappa r^{\alpha})ar^{-\frac{k}{p}}\bar{m}(r)^{\frac{1}{q}}\\ - (4k+2)\kappa r^{\alpha-1}\bar{m}(r) - 4\kappa r^{\alpha}\bar{m}'(r)\end{aligned}$$

Since $\kappa r^{\alpha} < 1$ we get that

$$\bar{m}'(r) + ar^{-\frac{k}{p}}\bar{m}(r)^{\frac{1}{q}} + (4k+2)\kappa r^{\alpha-1}\bar{m}(r) \geq \frac{1}{5}\frac{d}{dr}\int_{B_r(b)}\frac{|\nabla^{\perp}d|^2}{d^k}d\mu_V \geq 0$$

and multiplying by $\bar{m}(r)^{-\frac{1}{q}}$ we get

$$\bar{m}'(r)\bar{m}(r)^{-\frac{1}{q}} + (4k+2)\kappa r^{\alpha-1}\bar{m}(r)^{\frac{1}{p}} \geq -ar^{-\frac{k}{p}}.$$

Let

$$\Phi(r) = \frac{4k+2}{p\alpha}\kappa r^{\alpha} \tag{2}$$

then by multiplying the above inequlity by $p^{-1}e^{\Phi(r)}$ we have that

$$\left(e^{\Phi(r)}\bar{m}(r)^{\frac{1}{p}}\right)' \geq -\frac{a}{p}e^{\Phi(r)}r^{-\frac{k}{p}} \geq -\frac{a}{p}\exp\left(\frac{4k+2}{p\alpha}\right)r^{-\frac{k}{p}}.$$

Finally, letting

$$\Lambda = \frac{a}{p-k}\exp\left(\frac{4k+2}{pa}\right) \tag{3}$$

we get that

$$\left(e^{\Phi(r)}\bar{m}(r)^{\frac{1}{p}} + \Lambda r^{1-\frac{k}{p}}\right)' \geq 0$$

which proves the lemma. □

As in the interior case [All72, Sim83], immediate consequences of Lemma 2.5 are the following results about the density at points on B and the existence of tangent cones.

Corollary 2.6. *The density*

$$\Theta_V(b) = \lim_{\rho\downarrow 0}\omega_k^{-1}\bar{m}(r)$$

exists for all $b \in B\cap U$ and is upper semicontinuous as a function on $B\cap U$:

$$\Theta_V(b) \geq \limsup_{\substack{y\to b\\ y\in B}}\Theta_V(y).$$

Corollary 2.7. *V has a tangent cone at all points $b \in B\cap U$.*

We also have the following corollary about the density at boundary points, for the proof of which we refer to [All75] since it is identical to the case when B is a $C^{1,1}$ submanifold.

Corollary 2.8. *For all $b \in B \cap U$*

$$\Theta_V(b) \geq \frac{1}{2}.$$

Finally we want to prove one more monotonicity lemma.

Lemma 2.9. *Let $r_0 > 0$ be such that $4\kappa r_0^\alpha < 1/2$, $\Lambda r_0^{1-k/p} \leq 1/2(\omega_k/2)^{1/p}$, where Λ is as in* Lemma 2.5.

There exists a function $\Psi(r)$ such that for all $0 < \sigma < r < r_0$ and $b \in B$ such that $B_r(b) \subset U$

$$e^{\Psi(\sigma)}\bar{m}(\sigma) \leq e^{\Psi(\rho)}\bar{m}(\rho) - \frac{1}{2}\int_{B_r(b)\setminus B_\sigma(b)} \frac{|\nabla^\perp d|^2}{d^k} d\mu_V \tag{1}$$

and

$$e^{-\Psi(\sigma)}\bar{m}(\sigma) \geq e^{-\Psi(\rho)}\bar{m}(\rho) - 2\int_{B_r(b)\setminus B_\sigma(b)} \frac{|\nabla^\perp d|^2}{d^k} d\mu_V. \tag{2}$$

In particular

$$\Psi(r) = 4(2k+1)\left(a\lambda^{-\frac{1}{p}}\left(1 - \frac{k}{p}\right)^{-1} r^{1-\frac{k}{p}} + \alpha^{-1}\kappa r^\alpha\right)$$

where $\lambda = \frac{1}{2^p}\exp\left(-\frac{4k+2}{\alpha}\right)\frac{\omega_k}{2}$.

Proof. We first get a lower bound for $\bar{m}(r)$ by letting $\sigma \downarrow 0$ in the monotonicity formula of Lemma 2.5 and using the lower bound for the density at a boundary point (Corollary 2.8):

$$\bar{m}(r)^{\frac{1}{p}} \geq \frac{1}{2}\exp\left(-\frac{4k+2}{p\alpha}\right)\left(\frac{\omega_k}{2}\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \Rightarrow .$$

$$m(r) \geq \lambda r^k$$

where $\lambda = \frac{1}{2^p}\exp\left(-\frac{4k+2}{\alpha}\right)\frac{\omega_k}{2}$. Hence we have that

$$\int_{B_r(b)} |H| d\mu_V \leq a m(r)^{1-\frac{1}{p}} \leq a\lambda^{-\frac{1}{p}} m(r) r^{-\frac{k}{p}} = a\lambda^{-\frac{1}{p}}\bar{m}(r) r^{\frac{k}{q}}. \tag{3}$$

We estimate the singular measure as we did before (in 2.4), using the monotonicity inequality for tubular neighborhoods (inequality (17) in the proof of Lemma 2.1), but now estimating the terms involving H by (3):

$$\|V_{\text{sing}}(B_r(b))\| \leq (4k+2)r^{k-1}\bar{m}(r) + 4a\lambda^{-\frac{1}{p}} r^{\frac{k}{q}}\bar{m}(r) + 4r^k\bar{m}'(r).$$

Using this estimate in the monotonicity identity 2.2 we get

$$\bar{m}'(r) - \left(a\lambda^{-\frac{1}{p}} r^{-\frac{k}{p}} + \kappa r^{\alpha-1}\right)(4(2k+1))\bar{m}(r) \leq 2\frac{d}{dr}\int_{B_r(b)} \frac{|\nabla^\perp d|^2}{d^k} d\mu_V$$

where we have used the assumption $4\kappa r^\alpha < 1/2$, and similarly we get

$$\bar{m}'(r) + \left(a\lambda^{-\frac{1}{p}} r^{-\frac{k}{p}} + \kappa r^{\alpha-1}\right)(4(2k+1))\bar{m}(r) \geq \frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dr}\int_{B_r(b)} \frac{|\nabla^\perp d|^2}{d^k} d\mu_V.$$

Let

$$\Psi(r) = 4(2k+1)\left(a\lambda^{-\frac{1}{p}}\left(1 - \frac{k}{p}\right)^{-1} r^{1-\frac{k}{p}} + \alpha^{-1}\kappa r^\alpha\right)$$

Multiplying the first inequality by $e^{-\Psi(r)}$ and the second one by $e^{\Psi(r)}$ we have that

$$\left(e^{-\Psi(r)}\bar{m}(r)\right)' \leq 2\frac{d}{dr}\int_{B_r(b)} \frac{|\nabla^\perp d|^2}{d^k} d\mu_V.$$

and

$$\left(e^{\Psi(r)}\bar{m}(r)\right)' \geq \frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dr}\int_{B_r(b)} \frac{|\nabla^\perp d|^2}{d^k} d\mu_V$$

and the lemma then follows by integrating these two inequalities. □

3. Boundary Regularity Theorem

From now on we assume that V, B are as defined in Section 1, satisfying 1.1 and properties P_1-P_3 and we take R small enough (depending on k, α, p) so that the monotonicity Lemmas 2.5, 2.9 are satisfied in $U = B_R(0)$.

For simplifying computations we make the following assumption:

$$T_0 B = \mathbb{R}^{k-1} \times \{0\}^{n-k+1}$$

so that

$$B \cap B_R(0) = \operatorname{graph} \psi \cap B_R(0)$$

where

3.1 $$\psi : B_R(0) \cap \mathbb{R}^{k-1} \to \mathbb{R}^{n-k+1}$$

is such that $\psi(0) = 0$, $D\psi(0) = 0$ and

$$\frac{\|\psi\|_0}{R} + \|D\psi\|_0 + R^\alpha [D\psi]_\alpha \leq \kappa$$

(cf. Remark 1.2). We will be using the notation $T' = \mathbb{R}^{k-1} \times \{0\}^{n-k+1}$ and $T'^\perp = \{0\}^{k-1} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-k+1}$, so that for the corresponding projections we have that

$$\operatorname{proj}_{T'}(x) = \operatorname{proj}_{T_0 B}(x) \text{ and } \operatorname{proj}_{T'^\perp}(x) = \operatorname{proj}_{N_0 B}(x) \text{ , for all } x \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Definition 3.2. *For each $a \in \mathbb{R}^n \cap B_R(0)$, we define $\omega(a)$, to be the unique point in $B \cap B_R(0)$ such that $a - \omega(a) \in T'^\perp$ and $\zeta(a)$ to be the real valued function $\zeta(a) = |a - \omega(a)|$, i.e.*

$$\omega(a) = (\operatorname{proj}_{T'}(a), \psi(\operatorname{proj}_{T'}(a)))$$

$$\zeta(a) = |\psi(\operatorname{proj}_{T'}(a)) - \operatorname{proj}_{T'^\perp}(a)|.$$

For all $a \notin B$ we define $\chi(a)$ to be the projection of $\mathbb{R}^n$ onto the subspace $\mathbb{R}^{k-1} \times \{0\}^{n-k+1} + \{t(a - \omega(a)) : t \in \mathbb{R}\}$.

Then the following holds

$$\begin{aligned} |\operatorname{proj}_{T'}(\omega(x) - \omega(a))|^2 &\geq |\omega(x) - \omega(a)|^2 - |\operatorname{proj}_{T'^\perp}(\omega(x) - \omega(a))|^2 \\ &\geq \left(1 - (R^\alpha \kappa)^2\right) |\omega(x) - \omega(a)|^2 \end{aligned}$$

and hence

3.3 $$\begin{aligned} |\omega(x) - \omega(a)| &\leq (1 - (R^\alpha\kappa)^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}} |\operatorname{proj}_{T'}(x - a)| \\ &\leq (1 - (R^\alpha\kappa)^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}} |x - a|. \end{aligned}$$

We state the following interior regularity lemma, which is a consequence of Allard's interior regularity theorem.

Lemma 3.4. *Assume that*

$$R^{-k}\omega_k^{-1}\mu_V(B_R(0)) \leq \frac{1+\delta}{2}$$

Then for each $0<\gamma<1$, $\eta>0$ *we can find* κ, a *and* δ *small enough so that*

- i $N = \operatorname{spt}\mu_V \cap B_{(1-\gamma)R}(0) \setminus B$ *is a non-empty continuously differentiable* k*-dimensional submanifold of* $\mathbb{R}^n$*, which is closed relative to* $B_{(1-\gamma)R}(0)\setminus B$.
- ii *For each* $a \in N$, $|\chi(a)^{\perp}(x-a)| \leq \eta|x-a|$, *for any* $x \in N \cap B_{\zeta(a)}(a)$.
- iii $\Theta_V(a) \leq 1+\eta$, *for any* $a \in N$.

The proof of this lemma is as in the case when B is a $C^{1,1}$ submanifold [All75, Theorem 4.3] and thus we omit it.

We will finally need the following definition:

Definition 3.5. *The* ***tilt-excess*** $E(x,r,T)$ *of the varifold* V *with respect to a* k*-dimensional subspace* T *of* $\mathbb{R}^n$ *is given by*

$$E(x,r,T) = r^{-k}\int_{B_r(x)} \| \operatorname{proj}_{T_yM} - \operatorname{proj}_T \|^2 d\mu_V(y).$$

We also define the following quantities

$$E^*(0,R,T) = \max\left\{E(0,R,T), R^{2(1-\frac{k}{p})}\left(\int_{B_R(0)} |H|^p\right)^{\frac{2}{p}}, (\kappa R^{\alpha})^2\right\}$$

and

$$E_*(0,R,T) = \max\left\{E(0,R,T), \varepsilon^{-1}R^{2(1-\frac{k}{p})}\left(\int_{B_R(0)} |H|^p\right)^{\frac{2}{p}}, \varepsilon^{-1}(\kappa R^{\alpha})^2\right\}.$$

Often and when there is no confusion we will simply write E^*, E_* *for the above two defined quantities.*

Lemma 3.6. *For any* $b \in B$, $r>0$ *such* $B_r(b) \subset B_R(0)$ *and* T *a* k*-dimensional subspace with* $T_bB \subset T$ *we have that*

$$E(b,r/2,T) \leq c\left(r^{-k-2}\int_{B_r(b)} \operatorname{dist}(x,T)^2 d\mu_V(x) + r^{2-k}\int_{B_r(b)} |H|^2 d\mu_V + (\kappa r^{\alpha})^2\right)$$

where c *is a constant that depends only on* n,k,R.

Remark 3.7. *Applying Holder to the RHS of the inequality of* Lemma 3.6 *we get*

$$\begin{aligned} E(b,r/2,T) \leq c\Bigg(& r^{-k-2}\int_{B_r(b)} \operatorname{dist}(x,T)^2 d\mu_V(x) \\ &+ r^{2(1-\frac{k}{p})}\left(\int_{B_r(b)} |H|^p d\mu_V\right)^{\frac{2}{p}} + (\kappa r^{\alpha})^2\Bigg). \end{aligned}$$

For the proof of Lemma 3.6 we will need the following notation: Let

$$P = \{0\}^{k-1}\times\mathbb{R}\times\{0\}^{n-k} = T'^{\perp}\cap(\mathbb{R}^k\times\{0\}^{n-k}) = N_0B\cap(\mathbb{R}^k\times\{0\}^{n-k})$$

and let

$$\bar{B} = B + P.$$

Then $\bar{B}$ is a $C^{1,\alpha}$, k-dimensional manifold and $\bar{B}\cap B_R(0)$ can be written as a $C^{1,\alpha}$ graph above $\mathbb{R}^k\times\{0\}^{n-k}$, i.e. there exists a $C^{1,\alpha}$ function

$$\bar{\psi}:\mathbb{R}^k\cap B_R(0)\to\mathbb{R}^{n-k}$$

such that $\bar{B}\cap B_R(0)=\operatorname{graph}\bar{\psi}\cap B_R(0)$ and

$$\frac{\|\bar{\psi}\|_0}{R}+\|D\bar{\psi}\|_0+R^\alpha[D\bar{\psi}]_\alpha\leq\kappa. \tag{3.8}$$

In particular for $x\in\mathbb{R}^{k-1}$ and $(x,x')\in\mathbb{R}^k$ we have that

$$\bar{\psi}(x,x')=\big(\psi^2(x),\ldots,\psi^{n-k+1}(x)\big)$$

where $\psi=(\psi^1,\psi^2,\ldots,\psi^{n-k+1}):\mathbb{R}^{k-1}\to\mathbb{R}^{n-k+1}$ is the function whose graph is equal to B in $B_R(0)$ as defined in 3.1. Note that the smoothness conditions 1.1 and Remark 1.4 still hold with B replaced by $\bar{B}$.

Finally we define $\bar{\rho}$ to be the distance from $\bar{B}$, i.e. $\bar{\rho}(x)=\operatorname{dist}(x,\bar{B})$.

proof of Lemma 3.6. Without loss of generality we can assume that $b=0$, $T=\mathbb{R}^k\times\{0\}^{n-k}$.

Let $\mathcal{W}$ be a Whitney partition of $\mathbb{R}^n\setminus\bar{B}$. Then

$$B_R(0)\setminus\bar{B}\subset\cup_{\mathbb{C}\in\mathcal{W}}\mathbb{C}$$

where the elements $\mathbb{C}$ of $\mathcal{W}$ are cubes such that if $\bar{\rho}_{\mathbb{C}}=\operatorname{dist}(\mathbb{C},\bar{B})>0$ then

$$\operatorname{diam}\mathbb{C}\leq\bar{\rho}_{\mathbb{C}}\leq 3\operatorname{diam}\mathbb{C}.$$

Let $x_{\mathbb{C}}\in\mathbb{C}$ be the center of the cube $\mathbb{C}$ and $y_{\mathbb{C}}\in\bar{B}$ be such that $|x_{\mathbb{C}}-y_{\mathbb{C}}|=\bar{\rho}(x_{\mathbb{C}})$. Finally let $\phi_{\mathbb{C}}$ be a partition of unity suboordinate to $\mathcal{W}$ and such that

$$|D\phi_{\mathbb{C}}(x)|\leq C\bar{\rho}(x)^{-1}$$

where C is an absolute constant.

For each $x\in\mathbb{C}$, we define $x'_{\mathbb{C}}$ to be the unique point in $\bar{B}\cap B(y_{\mathbb{C}},2\bar{\rho}_{\mathbb{C}})$ such that $x'_{\mathbb{C}}-x\in N_{y_{\mathbb{C}}}\bar{B}$. Then by Remark 1.4 we know that if $\bar{x}\in\bar{B}\cap B_R(0)$ is such that $|x-\bar{x}|=\bar{\rho}(x)$ then

$$|x'_{\mathbb{C}}-\bar{x}|\leq c\kappa\bar{\rho}(x)^{1+\alpha}\leq c\kappa\bar{\rho}_{\mathbb{C}}^{1+\alpha}. \tag{1}$$

We define the following vector field

$$X=\zeta^2\sum_{\mathbb{C}\in\mathcal{W}}\phi_{\mathbb{C}}X_{\mathbb{C}}$$

where

$$X_{\mathbb{C}}(x)=\operatorname{proj}_{T^\perp}(x-x'_{\mathbb{C}})$$

and ζ is a smooth real valued function with compact support in $B_r(0)$ (where r is as in the statement of the lemma) and such that

$$\zeta(x)=1,\forall x\in B_{r/2}(0)\text{ and }|D\zeta|\leq 3/r.$$

Since $X(x)=0$, for all $x\in B\cap B_R(0)$, the first variation formula implies that

$$\int\operatorname{div}_M Xd\mu_V=\int X\cdot Hd\mu_V. \tag{2}$$

We will estimate

$$\operatorname{div}_M X=2\zeta\sum_{\mathbb{C}\in\mathcal{W}}\phi_{\mathbb{C}}\nabla^M\zeta\cdot X_{\mathbb{C}}+\zeta^2\sum_{\mathbb{C}\in\mathcal{W}}\nabla^M\phi_C\cdot X_{\mathbb{C}}+\zeta^2\sum_{\mathbb{C}\in\mathcal{W}}\phi_{\mathbb{C}}\operatorname{div}_M X_{\mathbb{C}}. \tag{3}$$

For each $\mathbb{C} \in \mathcal{W}$ we have that

$$\operatorname{div}_M X_{\mathbb{C}} = \frac{1}{2} |\operatorname{proj}_{T_xM} - \operatorname{proj}_T|^2.$$

To see this let $\boldsymbol{t} = (t^{ij})$, $\boldsymbol{e} = (e^{ij})$ denote the matrices of the projections onto T and T_xM respectively, then

$$\begin{aligned} |\operatorname{proj}_{T_xM} - \operatorname{proj}_T|^2 &= \sum_{j=1}^{n} e_j(\boldsymbol{e} + \boldsymbol{t} - 2\boldsymbol{et})e_j = 2k - 2\sum_{j=1}^{n} e_j(\boldsymbol{et})e_j \\ &= 2\sum_{j=1}^{n} e_j(\boldsymbol{e}(I - \boldsymbol{t}))e_j = 2\sum_{i=k+1}^{n} e^{ii}. \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

To estimate the two first terms on the RHS of (3), note that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\mathbb{C}\in\mathcal{W}} \nabla^M \phi_{\mathbb{C}} \cdot X_{\mathbb{C}} &= \nabla^M \phi_{\mathbb{C}} \cdot (\operatorname{proj}_{T^\perp}(x - x'_{\mathbb{C}}) - \operatorname{proj}_{T^\perp}(x - \bar{x})) \\ &= \sum_{\mathbb{C}\in\mathcal{W}} D\phi_{\mathbb{C}} \cdot (\operatorname{proj}_{T_xM} \circ \operatorname{proj}_{T^\perp})(\bar{x} - x'_{\mathbb{C}}) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\nabla^M \zeta \cdot X_{\mathbb{C}}(x) = D\zeta \cdot (\operatorname{proj}_{T_xM} \circ \operatorname{proj}_{T^\perp})(\operatorname{proj}_{T^\perp}(x - x'_{\mathbb{C}})). \tag{5}$$

Hence using (1), 3.8 and the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, we have that for any $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\left| \zeta^2 \sum_{\mathbb{C}\in\mathcal{W}} \nabla^M \phi_C \cdot X_{\mathbb{C}} \right| \le \varepsilon\zeta^2 |\operatorname{proj}_{T_xM} - \operatorname{proj}_T|^2 + \frac{c}{\varepsilon}\zeta^2(\kappa r^\alpha)^2$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} |\zeta\nabla^M \zeta \cdot X_{\mathbb{C}}| &\le |\zeta||D\zeta||\operatorname{proj}_{T_xM} - \operatorname{proj}_T|(|\operatorname{proj}_{T^\perp}(x)| + |\operatorname{proj}_{T^\perp}(x'_{\mathbb{C}})|) \\ &\le \varepsilon\zeta^2 |\operatorname{proj}_{T_xM} - \operatorname{proj}_T|^2 + \frac{c}{\varepsilon} r^{-2} \left(\operatorname{dist}(x, T)\right)^2 + \frac{c}{\varepsilon}(\kappa r^\alpha)^2. \end{aligned}$$

For estimating the RHS of the first variation formula (2) we note that

$$|X_{\mathbb{C}} \cdot H| \le \frac{\operatorname{dist}(x, T)^2}{r^2} + (\kappa r^\alpha)^2 + 2r^2|H|^2$$

Hence using the above estimates in the first variation formula (2), for sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, we get the required estimate of the lemma

$$\begin{aligned} E(0, r/2, T) \le c\bigg(r^{-k-2} &\int_{B_r(b)} \operatorname{dist}(x, T)^2 d\mu_V(x) \\ &+ r^{2-k} \int_{B_r(b)} |H|^2 d\mu_V + (\kappa r^\alpha)^2 \bigg). \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 3.9 (Lipschitz approximation)**.** *Assume that*

$$R^{-k}\omega_k^{-1}\mu_V(B_R(0)) \le \frac{1 + \delta}{2}. \tag{1}$$

For any $\gamma \in (0, 1/4)$, $l \in (0, 1]$ *there exists* $\delta > 0$ *such that if* (1) *holds, then there exists a Lipschitz function*

$$f = (f^1, f^2, \ldots, f^{n-k}) : \widetilde{H} \cap B_{\gamma R}(0) \to \mathbb{R}^{n-k}$$

where $\widetilde{H}$ *is one of the two regions of* $T \cap B_R(0)$ *defined by* $\operatorname{proj}_T(B)$*, with* $\operatorname{Lip} f \le l$ *and*

$$\mathcal{H}^k\left(((\operatorname{spt} V \setminus \operatorname{graph} f) \cup (\operatorname{graph} f \setminus \operatorname{spt} V)) \cap B_{\gamma R}(0)\right) \le c l^{-2} E^* R^k \tag{2}$$

where $c = c(n,k)$ *is a constant,* $E^* = E^*(0,R,T)$ *and* T *is a* k*-dimensional subspace such that* $T' = T_0 B \subset T$.

Proof. We can assume that $E^* \le \delta_0 l^2$, a small multiple of l^2, since else we can trivially pick $f = 0$ and then appropriately choose c so that (2) holds.

For any $\gamma \in (0,1)$ we take δ, δ_0 small enough, so that the conclusions of the interior regularity lemma, Lemma 3.4, hold in $B_{\gamma R}(0)$ and with $\eta \le \eta(l)$ that we will choose later.

We define the following set

$$G = (B \cap B_{\gamma R}(0)) \cup (\operatorname{spt} V \cap B_{\gamma R}(0) \cap \{a : \|\chi(a) - \operatorname{proj}_T\| \le 2\eta(l)\}) \tag{3}$$

where $\chi(a)$ is as in Definition 3.2.

Claim: For all $x, y \in G$:

$$|\operatorname{proj}_{T^\perp}(x-y)| \le (10\eta(l) + 4{E^*}^{1/2})|x-y|. \tag{4}$$

Note first that if both x and y are in $B \cap B_{\gamma R}(0)$ then since $T^\perp \subset T'^\perp$ and by 1.1, we have that

$$|\operatorname{proj}_{T^\perp}(x-y)| \le 2{E^*}^{1/2}|x-y|.$$

So we can assume that one of them, say y, is not in B.

Assume first that

$$|x-y| < \zeta(y).$$

Then by Lemma 3.4 (ii) we have that $|\chi(y)^\perp(x-y)| \le \eta|x-y|$ and so

$$|\operatorname{proj}_{T^\perp}(x-y)| \le |\operatorname{proj}_{T^\perp} \circ \chi(y)(x-y)| + |\operatorname{proj}_{T^\perp} \circ \chi(y)^\perp(x-y)|| \le 3\eta(l)|x-y|.$$

Assume now that

$$|x-y| \ge \zeta(y).$$

Note that for all $y \in G$

$$|\operatorname{proj}_{T^\perp}(y - \omega(y))| = |(\operatorname{proj}_{T^\perp} \circ \chi(y))(y - \omega(y))| \le 2\eta\zeta(y).$$

Furthermore for δ_0 small enough (so that $(\kappa R^\alpha)^2 \le 3/4$), we have by 3.3 that $|\omega(x) - \omega(y)| \le 2|x-y|$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
|\operatorname{proj}_{T^\perp}(x-y)| &\le |\operatorname{proj}_{T^\perp}(x - \omega(x))| + |\operatorname{proj}_{T^\perp}(\omega(x) - \omega(y))| + |\operatorname{proj}_{T^\perp}(\omega(y) - y)| \\
&\le 2\eta\zeta(x) + |\operatorname{proj}_{T^\perp}(\omega(x) - \omega(a))| + 2\eta\zeta(y) \\
&\le 2\eta(|x-y| + \zeta(y) + |\omega(y) - \omega(x)|) + 2\kappa R^\alpha |\omega(x) - \omega(y)| + 2\eta|x-y| \\
&\le 10\eta(l)|x-y| + 4{E^*}^{1/2}|x-y|
\end{aligned}$$

and so the claim is true.

Since

$$|x-y| \le |\operatorname{proj}_{T^\perp}(x-y)| + |\operatorname{proj}_T(x-y)|$$

we have that for all $x, y \in G$:

$$|\operatorname{proj}_{T^\perp}(x-y)| \le (10\eta(l) + 4{E^*}^{1/2})(|\operatorname{proj}_{T^\perp}(x-y)| + |\operatorname{proj}_T(x-y)|).$$

So picking

$$\eta(l) = \frac{l}{40}$$

and

$$\delta_0 \leq \frac{1}{16^2} \Rightarrow E^{*1/2} \leq \frac{l}{16}$$

we have that

$$10\eta(l) + 4E^{*1/2} \leq \frac{l}{2} \tag{5}$$

and therefore

$$|\operatorname{proj}_{T^\perp}(x-y)| \leq l|\operatorname{proj}_T(x-y)|.$$

Hence $G = \operatorname{graph} f$ where $f : \operatorname{proj}_T(G) \to T^\perp$ is a Lipschitz function with lipschitz constant at most l.

Note that by definition of G and by the interior regularity lemma (Lemma 3.4 (ii)), $\operatorname{proj}_T(G)$ lies only on one region of $T \cap B_{\gamma R}(0)$ defined by $\operatorname{proj}_T(B)$. Calling this region $\widetilde{H}$ and using the extension theorem for Lipschitz functions we can construct a Lipshitz function

$$f : \widetilde{H} \cap B_{\gamma R}(0) \to T^\perp$$

with $\operatorname{Lip} f \leq l$ and such that $G \subset \operatorname{graph} f$.

By the above height claim (4) and by the choice of $\eta(l), \delta_0$ (cf. (5)) we have that

$$|\operatorname{proj}_{T^\perp}(x)| = |\operatorname{proj}_{T^\perp}(x-0)| \leq l/2|x| \quad ,\forall x \in G$$

and thus, by truncating the extension if necessary, we also have that

$$\sup_{\widetilde{H} \cap B_{\gamma R}(0)} |f| = \sup_{\operatorname{proj}_T(G)} |f| = \sup\{\operatorname{dist}(x,T) : x \in G\} \leq l\frac{\gamma R}{2}. \tag{6}$$

Let

$$G' = (\operatorname{spt} V \cap B_{\gamma R}(0)) \setminus G \supset (\operatorname{spt} V \cap B_{\gamma R}(0)) \setminus \operatorname{graph} f.$$

We want to estimate $\mathcal{H}^k(G')$.

For $x \in G'$ we have that

$$\|\operatorname{proj}_{T_xM} - \operatorname{proj}_T\| \geq \|\chi(x) - \operatorname{proj}_T\| - \|\operatorname{proj}_{T_xM} - \chi(x)\| > 2\eta(l) - \eta(l) \geq \eta(l) \Rightarrow$$

$$|\operatorname{proj}_{T_xM} - \operatorname{proj}_T|^2 > c\eta(l)^2$$

where c depends on n, k. By Lemma 3.4 (i), (iii), $\operatorname{spt} V$ is smooth away from B and $\Theta_V(x) \leq 1 + \eta(l)$, $\forall x \in \operatorname{spt} V \setminus B$. So for every $x \in G'$, there exists $\rho_x < \min\{\rho(x), (1-\gamma)R\}/5$ such that

$$\|\operatorname{proj}_{T_y} - \operatorname{proj}_T\|^2 \geq \frac{c}{2}\eta(l)^2 \ , \forall y \in B_{\rho_x}(x)$$

and

$$\frac{1}{2} \leq \frac{\mu_V B_{5\rho}(x)}{\omega_k (5\rho)^k} \leq 2(1+\eta(l)) \ , \forall \rho \leq \rho_x.$$

Hence for all $\rho \leq \rho_x$ we have

$$\rho^{-k} \int_{B_\rho(x)} |\operatorname{proj}_T - \operatorname{proj}_{T_yM}|^2 d\mu_V(y) \geq \frac{c}{2}\eta(l)^2 \rho^{-k} \mu_V(B_\rho(x)) \geq c\frac{\eta(l)^2}{4}\omega_k.$$

The collection of balls $\{B_{\rho_x}(x)\}_{x\in G'}$ is a cover for G', so using the 5-times covering lemma we can pick $\{x_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}\subset G'$ such that $\{B_{\rho_{x_i}}(x_i)\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ are disjoint and $G'\subset\bigcup_{1\in\mathbb{N}}B_{5\rho_{x_i}}(x_i)\subset B_R(0)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_V(G')&\le\sum_{i\in\mathbb{N}}\mu_V(B_{5\rho_{x_i}}(x_i))\le 2(1+\eta(l))\omega_k 5^k\sum_{i\in\mathbb{N}}\rho_{x_i}^k\\&\le c5^k\frac{1+\eta(l)}{\eta(l)^2}\sum_{i\in\mathbb{N}}\int_{B_{\rho_{x_i}}(x_i)}|\operatorname{proj}_T-\operatorname{proj}_{T_yM}|^2d\mu_V(y)\le c\frac{1+\eta(l)}{\eta(l)^2}R^kE^*.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\Theta_V(x)\ge 1$ for $x\in G'$ we get that

$$\mathcal{H}^k(G')\le\mu_V(G')\le cl^{-2}R^kE^*.$$

Hence

$$H^k((\operatorname{spt}V\cap B_{\gamma R}(0)\setminus\operatorname{graph}f)\le cl^{-2}E^*R^k. \tag{7}$$

Now we want to estimate the measure of $(\operatorname{graph}f\setminus\operatorname{spt}V)\cap B_{\gamma R}(0)$. We will do this using the following:

Claim: For l,δ_0 sufficiently small, the following holds: For each $x\in(\operatorname{graph}f\setminus\operatorname{spt}V)\cap B_{\gamma R/4}(0)$ there exists $\tilde{x}\in(\operatorname{graph}f\setminus\operatorname{spt}V)\cap B_{\gamma R/4}(0)$, $\rho_x>0$ such that the following hold:

- i $B_{\rho_x}(\widetilde{x})\cap\operatorname{spt}V=\emptyset$, $\overline{B}_{\rho_x}(\widetilde{x})\cap\operatorname{spt}V\neq\emptyset$
- ii $B_{(1+\frac{1}{10})\rho_x}(\widetilde{x})\cap B=\emptyset$
- iii $x\in\overline{B}_{4\rho_x}(\widetilde{x})$

Notice that it suffices to prove the lemma for small values of l. That is because if it is true for any $l\le l_0$ and f_{l_0} is a lipschitz function as in the statement of the lemma with $l=l_0$, then for any $l>l_0$, f_{l_0} satisfies the lemma with the constant c of the lemma (in (2)) replaced by cl_0^{-2}.

Proof of Claim: Given $x\in(\operatorname{graph}f\setminus\operatorname{spt}V)\cap B_{\gamma R/4}(0)$, let

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma=\max\{\rho:\exists y\in\operatorname{graph}f\cap\overline{B}_{\gamma R/4}\text{ such that }B_\rho(y)\cap\operatorname{spt}V=\emptyset\,,\\ \overline{B}_\rho(y)\cap\operatorname{spt}V\neq\emptyset\text{ and }x\in\overline{B}_{5\rho/4}(y)\}\end{aligned}.$$

Let $y=(y_1,f(y_1))\in\operatorname{graph}f\setminus\operatorname{spt}V$ be such that $B_\sigma(y)$ satisfies the above properties and let $\bar{y}=(\bar{y}_1,f(\bar{y}_1))\in B$ be such that $|y-\bar{y}|=\operatorname{dist}(y,B)$. Because of the choice of σ there exists $z=(z_1,f(z_1))\in\operatorname{spt}V\cap\partial B_\sigma(y)$ such that $\operatorname{dist}(z_1,\partial\widetilde{H})\ge|y_1-\bar{y}_1|-\beta$ with $\beta\to 0$ as $l,\delta_0\to 0$, so that for l,δ_0 sufficiently small $\operatorname{dist}(z_1,\partial\widetilde{H})\ge\sigma/4$.

Then we can pick $\widetilde{x}_1\in B^k_\sigma(y_1)$, so that for $\widetilde{x}=(\widetilde{x}_1,f(\widetilde{x}_1))$ we have the following: $y\in B_{\sigma/2}(\widetilde{x})\subset B_\sigma(y)$, $z\in B_{5\sigma/4}(\widetilde{x})$ and $B_{11\sigma/10}(\widetilde{x})\cap B=\emptyset$ (e.g. pick $\widetilde{x}_1$ in the direction of $y_1-\bar{y}_1$ and such that $|\widetilde{x}_1-y_1|<\sigma/10$). So that the claim is true with $\rho_x\in(\sigma/3,5\sigma/4)$.

Now let $x\in(\operatorname{graph}f\setminus\operatorname{spt}V)\cap B_{\gamma R/4}$, $B_{\rho_x}(\widetilde{x})$ be as in the above claim and let y be such that $y\in\operatorname{spt}V\cap\partial B_{\rho_x}(\widetilde{x})$. Then by the interior monotonicity formula [Sim83, Theorem 17.6] and for δ_0 sufficiently small we have that

$$\left(\frac{11}{10}\rho_x\right)^{-k}\mu_V(B_{\frac{11}{10}\rho_x}(\widetilde{x}))\ge\frac{1}{11^k}\left(\frac{1}{10}\rho_x\right)^{-k}\mu_V(B_{\frac{1}{10}\rho_x}(y))\ge\omega_k 11^{-k-1} \tag{8}$$

and

$$\left(\frac{11}{10}\rho_x\right)^{-k}\mu_V(B_{\frac{11}{10}\rho_x}(\widetilde{x}))\leq 2\int_{B_{\frac{11}{10}\rho_x}(\widetilde{x})\setminus B_{\rho_x}(\widetilde{x})}\frac{|\nabla^{\perp}d|^2}{d^k}d\mu_V.$$

Since

$$|\nabla^{\perp}d(z)|^2=|\operatorname{proj}_{N_zM}(D|z-\widetilde{x}|)|^2=\left|\operatorname{proj}_{N_zM}\left(\frac{z-\widetilde{x}}{|z-\widetilde{x}|}\right)\right|^2$$

we get that

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_V(B_{\frac{11}{10}\rho_x}(\widetilde{x}))&\leq c\rho_x^k\int_{B_{\frac{11}{10}\rho_x}(\widetilde{x})}\left|\operatorname{proj}_{N_zM}\left(\frac{z-\widetilde{x}}{\sigma}\right)\right|^2d\mu_V(z)\\&\leq c\Bigg(\int_{B_{\frac{11}{10}\rho_x}(\widetilde{x})}\left|\operatorname{proj}_{T^{\perp}}\left(\frac{z-\widetilde{x}}{\sigma}\right)\right|^2d\mu_V(z)\\&\qquad+\int_{B_{\frac{11}{10}\rho_x}(\widetilde{x})}|\operatorname{proj}_{T_zM}-\operatorname{proj}_T|^2d\mu_V(z)\Bigg).\end{aligned}$$

Since $\widetilde{x}\in\operatorname{graph}f$ and $\operatorname{Lip}f\leq l$ we have that for $z\in\operatorname{graph}f$

$$\left|\operatorname{proj}_{T^{\perp}}\left(\frac{z-\widetilde{x}}{\sigma}\right)\right|^2\leq l^2$$

hence

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_V(B_{\frac{11}{10}\rho_x}(\widetilde{x}))\leq c\Bigg(&l^2\mu_V(B_{\frac{11}{10}\rho_x}(\widetilde{x}))+\mu_V\left(B_{\frac{11}{10}\rho_x}(\widetilde{x})\setminus\operatorname{graph}f\right)\\&+\int_{B_{\frac{11}{10}\rho_x}(\widetilde{x})}|\operatorname{proj}_{T_zM}-\operatorname{proj}_{_T}|^2d\mu_V(z)\Bigg)\end{aligned}\tag{9}$$

We can take l small enough so that $cl^2\leq 1/2$, where c as in (9). Using (8) we have that

$$\rho_x^k\leq c\Bigg(\mu_V(B_{\frac{11}{10}\rho_x}(\widetilde{x})\setminus\operatorname{graph}f)+\int_{B_{\frac{11}{10}\rho_x}(\widetilde{x})}|\operatorname{proj}_{T_zM}-\operatorname{proj}_T|^2d\mu_V(z)\Bigg).$$

Hence for any $x=(x_1,f(x_1))\in(\operatorname{graph}f\setminus\operatorname{spt}V)\cap B_{\gamma R/4}$ we can find $\widetilde{x}=(\widetilde{x}_1,\widetilde{f(x_1)})\in(\operatorname{graph}f\setminus\operatorname{spt}V)\cap B_{\gamma R/4}$ and $\rho=\rho(x_1)$ so that $x\in B_{4\rho_x}(\widetilde{x})$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H}^k(B^k_{20\rho}(\widetilde{x}_1))&\leq c\Bigg(\mu_V(B_{\frac{11}{10}\rho}(\widetilde{x})\setminus\operatorname{graph}f)+\int_{B_{\frac{11}{10}\rho}(\widetilde{x})}|\operatorname{proj}_{T_zM}-\operatorname{proj}_T|^2d\mu_V(z)\Bigg)\\&\leq c\Bigg(\mu_V\left(\left((B^k_{\frac{11}{10}\rho}(\widetilde{x}_1)\times\mathbb{R}^{n-k})\cap B_{\gamma R}(0)\right)\setminus\operatorname{graph}f\right)\\&\qquad+\int_{(B^k_{\frac{11}{10}\rho}(\widetilde{x}_1)\times\mathbb{R}^{n-k})\cap B_{\gamma R}(0)}|\operatorname{proj}_{T_zM}-\operatorname{proj}_T|^2d\mu_V(z)\Bigg).\end{aligned}$$

Using the 5-times covering lemma we can take a disjoint collection $\{B^k_{4\rho(x_1)}(\widetilde{x}_1)\}$ such that

$$\operatorname{proj}_T\left((\operatorname{graph}f\setminus\operatorname{spt}V)\cap B_{\gamma R/4}(0)\right)\subset\cup_{x_1}B^k_{20\rho(x_1)}(\widetilde{x}_1)$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H}^k\left(\operatorname{proj}_T\left((\operatorname{graph} f\setminus \operatorname{spt} V)\cap B_{\gamma R/4}(0)\right)\right) &\leq \sum_{x_1}\mathcal{H}^k(B^k_{20\rho(x_1)}(\widetilde{x}_1))\\ &\leq c\biggl(\mu_V(B_{\gamma R}(0)\setminus \operatorname{graph} f) \qquad (10)\\ &\quad + \int_{B_{\gamma R}(0)}|\operatorname{proj}_{T_zM}-\operatorname{proj}_T|^2 d\mu_V(z)\biggr).\end{aligned}$$

The fact that $\operatorname{Lip} f\leq l$ along with (10) and (7) imply that

$$\mathcal{H}^k\left((\operatorname{graph} f\setminus \operatorname{spt} V)\cap B_{\gamma R/4}(0)\right)\leq cl^{-2}R^kE^*.$$

Hence the lemma is true with $\gamma=\gamma/4$.

$\square$

Remark 3.10. *Let $f:\widetilde{H}\cap B^k_{\gamma R}(0)\to\mathbb{R}^{n-k}$ be the Lipschitz function constructed in* Lemma 3.9 *and suppose that $E^*\leq\varepsilon$. Then for ε small enough the following holds: If $a\in(\operatorname{spt} V\cap B_{\gamma R}(0))\setminus \operatorname{graph} f$ then $\rho(a)\leq\omega_k^{-1/k}E^{1/2k}R$.*

To see this recall that we picked δ, E^* small enough, so that Lemma 3.4 *holds with $\eta=\eta(l)=l/40$. Hence we have*

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_V(B_{\rho(a)}(a))|T-\chi(a)|^2 &\leq \int_{B_{\rho(a)}(a)}|\operatorname{proj}_{T_xM}-\operatorname{proj}_T|^2 d\mu_V(x)+\mu_V(B_{\rho(a)}(a))\eta^2\\ &\leq R^kE+\mu_V(B_{\rho(a)}(a))\eta^2.\end{aligned}$$

Using the interior monotonicity formula (cf. [Sim83, Theorem 17.6]*), we can pick ε small enough so that*

$$\rho(a)^{-k}\mu_V(B_{\rho(a)}(a))\geq\frac{1}{2}\omega_k$$

and therefore if $\rho(a)\geq\omega_k^{-1/k}E^{1/2k}R$ then

$$|T-\chi(a)|^2\leq 2\omega_k^{-1}\left(\frac{R}{\rho(a)}\right)^k E+\eta^2\leq 4\eta^2$$

provided that $\varepsilon^{1/2}\leq\eta^2$. But this implies that $a\in G$, where G is the set defined in (3) *of the proof of* Lemma 3.9 *and satisfies $G\subset\operatorname{graph} f$.*

Lemma 3.11 (Harmonic approximation lemma)**.** *Let Ω be a domain in R^k such that $\partial\Omega$ is C^1 and $0\in\partial\Omega$. For any $r>0$, $\varepsilon>0$ there exists $\delta=\delta(k,\varepsilon)>0$ such that the following holds: If $f\in W^{1,2}(\Omega\cap B_r(0))$ is such that*

$$r^{-k}\int_{\Omega\cap B_r(0)}|Df|^2 d\mathcal{H}^k\leq 1,$$

$$r^{-1}\sup_{\partial\Omega\cap B_r(0)}|f|\leq\delta$$

and

$$r^{-k}\left|\int_{\Omega\cap B_r(0)}Df\cdot D\zeta d\mathcal{H}^k\right|\leq\delta\sup|D\zeta|$$

for any $\zeta\in C_c^\infty(B_r(0)\cap\Omega)$, and if

$$|\nu_{\partial\Omega}(x)\cdot(x-y)|\leq\delta|x-y|\,,\ \forall x,y\in\partial\Omega\cap B_r(0)$$

where $\nu_{\partial\Omega}$ denotes the outward pointing unit normal to $\partial\Omega$. Then there exists a function $w \in W^{1,2}(B_r(0))$ with the following properties: for some halfspace H of $\mathbb{R}^k$, w is harmonic in $H \cap B_r(0)$,

$$w(x) = 0\ ,\ \forall x \in B_r(0) \cap \partial H,$$

$$r^{-k} \int_{H \cap B_r(0)} |Dw|^2 d\mathcal{H}^k \leq 1$$

and

$$r^{-k-2} \int_{\Omega \cap B_r(0)} (w - f)^2 d\mathcal{H}^k \leq \varepsilon.$$

Proof. Suppose that the lemma is not true. Then for some $\varepsilon > 0$ we can find a sequence of domains $\{\Omega_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{N}}$ with $0 \in \Omega_i, \forall i$ and corresponding functions $f_i \in W^{1,2}(\Omega_i \cap B_r(0))$, such that for all i:

$$|\nu_{\partial\Omega_i}(x) \cdot (x-y)| \leq \frac{1}{i}|x-y|\ ,\ \forall x, y \in \partial\Omega_i \cap B_r(0) \tag{1}$$

$$r^{-k} \int_{\Omega_i \cap B_r(0)} |Df_i|^2 d\mathcal{H}^k \leq 1 \tag{2}$$

$$r^{-1} \sup_{\partial\Omega_i \cap B_r(0)} |f_i| \leq \frac{1}{i} \Rightarrow \omega_{k-1}^{-1} r^{-k} \int_{\partial\Omega_i \cap B_r(0)} |f_i| d\mathcal{H}^{k-1} \leq \frac{2}{i} \tag{3}$$

and

$$r^{-k} \left| \int_{\Omega_i \cap B_r(0)} Df_i \cdot D\zeta d\mathcal{H}^k \right| \leq \frac{1}{i} \sup |D\zeta| \tag{4}$$

for any $\zeta \in C_c^\infty(B_r(0) \cap \Omega_i)$, but such that

$$r^{-k-2} \int_{\Omega_i \cap B_r(0)} (w - f_i)^2 d\mathcal{H}^k > \varepsilon$$

for any $w \in W^{1,2}(B_r(0))$, such that for some halfspace H of $\mathbb{R}^k$, w is harmonic in $H \cap B_r(0)$, $w = 0$ on $\partial H \cap B_r(0)$ and

$$r^{-k} \int_{H \cap B_r(0)} |Dw|^2 d\mathcal{H}^k \leq 1.$$

Let

$$\bar{f}_i = \frac{1}{|\Omega_i \cap B_r(0)|} \int_{\Omega_i \cap B_r(0)} f_i d\mathcal{H}_k.$$

Then (2) and (3) imply that $\|f_i\|_{L^1(\Omega_i \cap B_r(0))} \leq cr^{k+1}$ and so $\|\bar{f}_i\|^2_{L^2(\Omega_i \cap B_r(0))} \leq cr^{k+2}$, with the constants c being uniform in i.

By the Poincare inequality we get

$$r^{-k-2} \int_{\Omega_i \cap B_r(0)} |f_i - \bar{f}_i|^2 d\mathcal{H}^k \leq cr^{-k} \int_{\Omega_i \cap B_r(0)} |Df_i|^2 d\mathcal{H}^k \leq c$$

and so

$$r^{-k-2} \int_{\Omega_i \cap B_r(0)} f_i^2 d\mathcal{H}^k \leq c$$

for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$.

Let $Ef_i \in W^{1,2}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ denote an extension of f_i to $\mathbb{R}^n$. Since $\|f_i\|_{W^{1,2}(\Omega_i \cap B_r(0))}$ are uniformly bounded we can also take Ef_i to have uniformly bounded $W^{1,2}$-norm and hence we can apply Rellich's theorem to conclude that after passing to a subsequence

$$\int_{B_r(0)} |Ef_i - w|^2 d\mathcal{H}^k \to 0$$

for some $w \in W^{1,2}(B_r(0))$.

Because of (1), after passing to a further subsequence, if necessary, we have that $\partial\Omega_i \cap B_r(0) \to \partial H \cap B_r(0)$ for some halfspace H of $\mathbb{R}^k$ and where the convergence is in the C^β sense for all $\beta < 1$. Hence we have that

$$\int_{B_r(0)\cap\Omega_i} |f_i - w|^2 d\mathcal{H}^k \to 0 \tag{5}$$

and also, by (2), (4) we get respectively

$$r^{-k}\int_{B_r(0)\cap H} |Dw|^2 d\mathcal{H}^k \leq 1$$

and

$$r^{-k}\int_{B_r(0)\cap H} Dw \cdot D\zeta d\mathcal{H}^k = 0$$

for all $\zeta \in C_c^\infty(B_r(0) \cap H)$, i.e. w is harmonic in $H \cap B_r(0)$.

Without loss of generality we can assume that $H = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^k : x^k \geq 0\}$. For any $\zeta \in C^\infty(B_r(0))$, we have that

$$\int_{B_r(0)\cap\Omega_i} D_k f_i \zeta d\mathcal{H}^k = -\int_{B_r(0)\cap\Omega_i} f_i D_k\zeta d\mathcal{H}^k + \int_{\partial\Omega_i\cap B_r(0)} f_i \zeta \nu^k_{\partial\Omega_i} d\mathcal{H}^{k-1}.$$

Taking the limit for $i \to \infty$ and using (3), (5) we get

$$\int_{B_r(0)\cap H} D_k w\zeta d\mathcal{H}^k = -\int_{B_r(0)\cap H} wD_k\zeta d\mathcal{H}^k$$

and so $w = 0$ on $B_r(0) \cap \partial H$.

Hence we have a contradiction. □

Theorem 3.12 (Tilt excess decay theorem)**.** *There exist $\varepsilon, \delta > 0$ and $\theta \in (0,1)$ such that if*

$$R^{-k}\omega_k^{-1}\mu_V(B_R(0)) \leq \frac{1+\delta}{2}$$

and

$$E_*(0,R,T) \leq \varepsilon \text{ , where } T = \mathbb{R}^k \times \{0\}^{n-k}$$

then

$$E_*(0,\theta R, S) \leq \max\{\theta^{2\alpha}, \theta^{2(1-k/p)}\}E_*(0,R,T)$$

for some k-dimensional subspace $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, such that $T' = \mathbb{R}^{k-1} \times \{0\}^{n-k+1} \subset S$.

Proof. By Lemmas 3.4, 3.9, for any $\gamma \in (0,1/4)$ and $\eta \in (0,1)$ we can take δ, ε small enough so that

$$\Theta_V(x) \leq 1+\eta \text{ for all } x \in B_{\gamma R}(0) \cap \operatorname{spt} V \tag{1}$$

and there exists a Lipschitz function $f = (f^1, f^2, \ldots, f^{n-k}) : \widetilde{H} \cap B^k_{\gamma R}(0) \to \mathbb{R}^{n-k}$ such that $\operatorname{Lip} f \leq 1$ and

$$\mathcal{H}^k\left(((\operatorname{graph} f \setminus \operatorname{spt} V) \cup (\operatorname{spt} V \setminus \operatorname{graph} f)) \cap B_{\gamma R}(0)\right) \leq cE^* R^k \tag{2}$$

where $c = c(n,k)$, $E^* = E^*(0,R,T)$ and recall that $\widetilde{H}$ is one of the two regions of T defined by $\operatorname{proj}_T B$.

The first variation formula, applied for the vector field $X = \zeta e_{k+j}$, where $1 \leq j \leq n-k$ and $\zeta \in C_c^\infty(B_{\gamma R}(0) \setminus B)$ gives:

$$\int_{B_R(0)} \zeta e_{k+j} \cdot H d\mu_V = \int_{B_R(0)} \nabla x^{k+j} \cdot \nabla \zeta d\mu_V.$$

Let $\widetilde{f}^j(x) = \widetilde{f}^j(x^1, \ldots, x^n) = f^j(x^1, \ldots, x^k)$ for $j = 1, \ldots, n-k$ and let $M_1 = M \cap \operatorname{graph} f$, where as previously we use the notation $M = \operatorname{spt} V$. Then on M_1 we have that $x^{k+j} = \widetilde{f}^j$, so

$$\int_{M_1} \nabla \widetilde{f}^j \cdot \nabla \zeta d\mu_V = -\int_{M \setminus M_1} \nabla x^{k+j} \cdot \nabla \zeta d\mu_V + \int_M \zeta e_{k+j} \cdot H d\mu_V$$

Since $E^* \leq E_*$, by (2) we have that

$$\mathcal{H}^k((M \setminus M_1) \cap B_{\gamma R}(0)) \leq c R^k E_*.$$

Using the assumption on $\mu_V(B_R(0))$ we get

$$\int_M \zeta e_{k+j} \cdot H d\mu_V \leq \|H\|_{L^p(B_R(0)}(\mu_V(B_{\gamma R}(0)))^{1-\frac{1}{p}} \sup|\zeta| \leq c E_*^{\frac{1}{2}} \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} R^k \sup|D\zeta|$$

where $c = c(k,p)$. Hence

$$\int_{M_1} \nabla \widetilde{f}^j \cdot \nabla \zeta d\mu_V \leq c R^k (E_* + E_*^{\frac{1}{2}} \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}) \sup|D\zeta|. \tag{3}$$

Furthermore, since

$$\frac{1}{2}|\operatorname{proj}_{T_x M} - \operatorname{proj}_T|^2 = \sum_{j=1}^{n-k} |\nabla x^{k+j}|^2$$

(cf. (4) in proof of Lemma 3.6) we have that

$$\int_{M_1} |\nabla \widetilde{f}^j|^2 d\mu_V = \int_{M_1} |\nabla x^{k+j}|^2 d\mu_V \leq R^k E \leq R^k E_*. \tag{4}$$

Now let $\zeta_1 \in C_c^1(B^k_{\gamma R/2}(0) \cap \widetilde{H})$. Then there exists a function $\widetilde{\zeta}_1 \in C_c^1(B_{\gamma R}(0) \setminus B)$ such that $\widetilde{\zeta}_1(x^1, x^2, \ldots, x^n) = \zeta_1(x^1, \ldots, x^k)$ in a neighborhood of $(B^k_{\gamma R/2}(0) \times \mathbb{R}^{n-k}) \cap \operatorname{spt} V \cap B_{\gamma R}$. This is true because for ε small enough we have that

$$\partial B_{\gamma R} \cap \operatorname{spt} V \cap (B^k_{\gamma R/2} \times \mathbb{R}^{n-k}) = \emptyset$$

(cf. Remark 3.10).

Note that on $M \cap B_{\gamma R}(0)$

$$D\widetilde{f}^j = \operatorname{proj}_T(D\widetilde{f}^j) \text{ and } D\widetilde{\zeta}_1 = \operatorname{proj}_T(D\widetilde{\zeta}_1)$$

so for all $x \in M_1 \cap B_{\gamma R}(0)$ we have

$$|\nabla \widetilde{f}^j \cdot \nabla \widetilde{\zeta}_1 - D\widetilde{f}^j \cdot D\widetilde{\zeta}_1| \leq |\operatorname{proj}_{T_x M} - \operatorname{proj}_T|^2 |D\widetilde{f}^j||D\widetilde{\zeta}_1|$$

and

$$\left|\left(\nabla \widetilde{f}^j\right)^2 - \left(D\widetilde{f}^j\right)^2\right| \leq |\operatorname{proj}_{T_x M} - \operatorname{proj}_T|^2 |D\widetilde{f}^j|^2.$$

Using these two estimates as well as (3) with ζ replaced by $\widetilde{\zeta_1}$ and (4) we get that

$$\left|R^{-k}\int_{M_1} D\widetilde{f}^j \cdot D\widetilde{\zeta_1} d\mu_V\right| \leq c(E_*^{\frac{1}{2}}\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} + E_*)\sup|D\widetilde{\zeta_1}| \tag{5}$$

and

$$R^{-k}\int_{M_1} |D\widetilde{f}^j|^2 d\mu_V \leq cE_* \tag{6}$$

where we have used the fact that $|D\widetilde{f}^j| < 1$ on M_1.

Define $F : \mathbb{R}^k \to \mathbb{R}^{n+k}$ to be $F(x) = (x, f(x)), \forall x \in B^k_{\gamma R}(0)$. Using the area formula for F, along with the above estimates (5), (6) and also the density and the measure estimate (1) and (2), we get that

$$\begin{aligned}\left|R^{-k}\int_{B^k_{\gamma R}(0)\cap\widetilde{H}} Df^j \cdot D\zeta_1(\theta\circ F)J(F)d\mathcal{H}^k\right| &\leq \left|R^{-k}\int_{M_1} D\widetilde{f}^j \cdot D\widetilde{\zeta_1} d\mu_V\right| \\ &\quad + \left|R^{-k}\int_{\operatorname{graph} f\setminus M_1} D\widetilde{f}^j \cdot D\widetilde{\zeta_1}\theta d\mathcal{H}^k\right| \\ &\leq c(E_*^{\frac{1}{2}}\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} + E_*)\sup|D\zeta_1|\end{aligned}$$

and

$$R^{-k}\int_{B^k_{\gamma R/2}(0)\cap\widetilde{H}} |Df^j|^2(\theta\circ F)J(F)d\mathcal{H}^k \leq cE_*$$

where $J(F)$ denotes the Jacobian of F.

Since for $J(F)$ we have that $1 \leq J(F) \leq \sqrt{1 + c|Df|^2}$ and for the density $1 \leq \theta \leq 1 + \eta$ for μ_V-almost every $x \in M$, we get that

$$R^{-k}\int_{\widetilde{H}\cap B^k_{\gamma R/2}} |Df^j|^2 d\mathcal{H}^k \leq R^{-k}\int_{B^k_{\gamma R/2}} |Df^j|^2(\theta\circ F)J(F)d\mathcal{H}^k \leq cE_* \tag{7}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\left|R^{-k}\int_{\widetilde{H}\cap B^k_{\gamma R/2}(0)} Df^j \cdot D\zeta_1 d\mathcal{H}^k\right| &\leq c(E_*^{\frac{1}{2}}\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}} + E_*\sup)|D\zeta_1| \\ &\quad + c\sup|D\zeta_1|R^{-k}\int_{B^k_{\gamma R/2}(0)} \eta|Df^j| + |Df^j|^2 d\mathcal{H}^k \\ &\leq c((\eta + \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}})E_*^{\frac{1}{2}} + E_*)\sup|D\zeta_1|.\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

Note also that by 1.1 we have that

$$|\operatorname{proj}_{N_x\partial\widetilde{H}}(x-y)| \leq \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}E_*^{\frac{1}{2}}|x-y|\,,\ \forall x, y \in \partial\widetilde{H}\cap B_{\gamma R/2}(0) \tag{9}$$

and

$$R^{-1}\sup_{\partial\widetilde{H}\cap B^k_{\gamma R/2}(0)} |f^j| \leq \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}E_*^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{10}$$

Because of the above estimates (7), (10), (9) and (8) we can apply the harmonic approximation lemma (Lemma 3.11) to the functions $g^j = E_*^{-1/2}f^j$. Hence for any $\sigma > 0$ we can choose $\varepsilon, \eta > 0$ small enough so that there exist functions $w^j \in W^{1,2}(B_{\gamma R/2}(0))$ that are harmonic on $H\cap B^k_{\gamma R/2}(0)$, where H is one of the halfspaces on T defined by $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^k : x_k = 0\}$ (recall that $T' = T_0B = \mathbb{R}^{k-1} \times \{0\}^{n-k+1}$) and such that

$$w^j = 0 \text{ on } \partial H \cap B^k_{\gamma R/2}(0)$$

$$R^{-k} \int_{H \cap B^k_{\gamma R/2}(0)} |Dw^j|^2 d\mathcal{H}^k \leq cE_* \tag{11}$$

and

$$R^{-k-2} \int_{\widetilde{H} \cap B^k_{\gamma R/2}(0)} |w^j - f^j|^2 d\mathcal{H}^k \leq \sigma E_*. \tag{12}$$

Without loss of generality we can assume that $H = \{x \in T : x_k \geq 0\}$. For each $j = 1, 2, \dots, n-k$ we define

$$u^j(x) = u^j(x^1, \dots, x^k) = \begin{cases} w^j(x^1, \dots, x^k), & \text{for } x^k \geq 0, x \in B^k_{\gamma R/2}(0) \\ -w^j(x^1, \dots, -x^k), & \text{for } x^k < 0, x \in B^k_{\gamma R/2}(0). \end{cases}$$

Then u^j are odd harmonic functions on $B^k_{\gamma R/2}(0)$ that agree with w^j on $H \cap B_{\gamma R/2}(0)$. So for $\lambda < \gamma/2$ and any multiindex α:

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{B^k_{\lambda R}(0)} |D^\alpha u^j| &\leq \left(\frac{k|\alpha|}{(\gamma/2 - \lambda)R} \right)^{|\alpha|-1} \omega_k^{-1} R^{-k/2} \|Du^j\|_{L^2(B^k_{\gamma R/2}(0))} \\ &\leq \left(\frac{k|\alpha|}{(\gamma/2 - \lambda)R} \right)^{|\alpha|-1} \sup_{B^k_{\gamma R/2}(0)} |Du^j| \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

We define the linear function $l^j(x) = u^j(0) + x \cdot Du^j(0) = x \cdot Du^j(0)$ and using the Taylor expansion of u^j we get that

$$\sup_{B^k_{\lambda R}(0)} |u^j - l^j| \leq c\lambda^2 R^{-k/2+2} \|Du^j\|_{L^2(B^k_{\gamma R/2}(0))}. \tag{14}$$

Using the estimates (14), (12) and (9) we get:

$$\begin{aligned} (\lambda R)^{-k-2} \int_{\widetilde{H} \cap B^k_{\lambda R}(0)} |f^j - l^j|^2 d\mathcal{H}^k &\leq (\lambda R)^{-k-2} \int_{H \cap \widetilde{H} \cap B^k_{\lambda R}(0)} |f^j - w^j|^2 d\mathcal{H}^k \\ &\quad + (\lambda R)^{-k-2} \int_{\widetilde{H} \cap B^k_{\lambda R}(0)} |u^j - l^j|^2 d\mathcal{H}^k \\ &\quad + (\lambda R)^{-k-2} \int_{(\widetilde{H} \setminus H) \cap B^k_{\lambda R}(0)} |f^j - u^j|^2 d\mathcal{H}^k \\ &\leq c \left(\lambda^{-k-2} \sigma E_* + \lambda^2 E_* + \varepsilon E_* \right). \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

Let $l = (l^1, l^2, \dots, l^{n-k}) : \mathbb{R}^k \to \mathbb{R}^{n-k}$. Note that $l(0) = 0$ and since all l^j are linear we have that $S = \operatorname{graph} l$ is a k dimensional subspace of $\mathbb{R}^n$. Also since u^j is an odd function we have that $u^j(x^1, \dots, x^{k-1}, 0) = 0$, $\forall j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n-k\}$ and so

$$l^j(x^1, \dots, x^{k-1}, 0) = (x^1, \dots, x^{k-1}, 0) \cdot Du^j(x^1, \dots, x^{k-1}, 0) = 0$$

hence $T' = \mathbb{R}^{k-1} \times \{0\}^{n-k+1} \subset S$. Furthermore:

$$\begin{aligned}(\lambda R)^{-k-2}\int_{B_{\lambda R}(0)} \operatorname{dist}(x,S)^2 d\mu_V &\le (\lambda R)^{-k-2}\int_{B_{\lambda R}(0)\cap M_1} \operatorname{dist}(x,S)^2 d\mu_V \\ &\quad + (\lambda R)^{-k-2}\int_{B_{\lambda R}(0)\cap(M\setminus \operatorname{graph} f)} \operatorname{dist}(x,S)^2 d\mu_V \\ &\le c(\lambda R)^{-k-2}\int_{B^k_{\lambda R}(0)\cap\widetilde{H}} \sum_{j=1}^{n-k} |f^j - l^j|^2 d\mathcal{H}^k \\ &\quad + (\lambda R)^{-k-2}\int_{B_{\lambda R}(0)\cap(M\setminus \operatorname{graph} f)} \operatorname{dist}(x,S)^2 d\mu_V.\end{aligned}$$

By Remark 3.10 and since $R^{-k}H^k((M\setminus \operatorname{graph} f)\cap B_{\lambda R}(0)) \le cE_*$ we have that

$$(\lambda R)^{-k-2}\int_{B_{\lambda R}(0)\cap(M\setminus \operatorname{graph} f)} \operatorname{dist}(x,S)^2 d\mu_V \le c\lambda^{-k-2}\varepsilon^{1/k}E_*.$$

Hence

$$(\lambda R)^{-k-2}\int_{B_{\lambda R}(0)} \operatorname{dist}(x,S)^2 d\mu_V \le c\sigma E_*\lambda^{-k-2} + c\lambda^2 E_*$$

provided that $\varepsilon^{1/k} \le \lambda^{4+k}$.

By Lemma 3.6 we can estimate the tilt-excess using the above height integral, which gives us

$$E(0,\lambda R/2,S) \le c\sigma E_*\lambda^{-k-2} + c\lambda^2 E_* + \lambda^{2(1-k/p)}\varepsilon E_* + \lambda^{2\alpha}\varepsilon E_*.$$

So pick λ so that $c\lambda^2 \le 1/4(\lambda/2)^{2(1-k/p)}$, take σ so that $c\sigma\lambda^{-k-2} \le 1/4(\lambda/2)^{2\alpha}$ and then pick ε small enough so that $\lambda^{2(1-k/p)}\varepsilon \le 1/4(\lambda/2)^{2(1-k/p)}$, $\lambda^{2\alpha}\varepsilon \le 1/4(\lambda/2)^{2\alpha}$, $\varepsilon^{1/k} \le \lambda^{4+k}$. Finally we need to take ε, η small enough and so that we can apply the harmonic approximation lemma with the selected σ (as we did above when constructing the harmonic functions w_j). Then for $\theta = \lambda/2$

$$E(0,\theta R,S) \le \left(\frac{\theta^{2(1-k/p)}}{2} + \frac{\theta^{2\alpha}}{2}\right) E_*(0,R,T).$$

Finally since

$$(\theta R)^{2(1-k/p)}\|H\|^2_{L^p(B_{\theta R}(0))} \le \theta^{2(1-k/p)}R^{2(1-\frac{k}{p})}\|H\|^2_{L^p(B_R(0))}$$

and

$$(\kappa(\theta R)^\alpha)^2 = \theta^{2\alpha}\left(\kappa R^\alpha\right)^2$$

we have

$$E_*(0,\theta R,S) \le \max\{\theta^{2\alpha}, \theta^{2(1-k/p)}\}E_*(0,R,T).$$

□

Theorem 3.13 (Boundary regularity theorem)**.** *We assume that*

$$R^{-k}\omega_k^{-1}\mu_V(B_R(0)) \le \frac{1+\delta}{2}$$

and

$$E_*(0,R,T) \le \varepsilon$$

where $T = \mathbb{R}^k \times \{0\}^{n-k}$.

Then for any $\gamma \in (0,1/32)$ *there exist* ε, δ *such that under the above hypotheses there exists a* $C^{1,m}$ *function*

$$f : \widetilde{H} \cap B^k_{\gamma R}(0) \to \mathbb{R}^{n-k}$$

where $m = \min\{\alpha, 1 - k/p\}$, $\widetilde{H}$ *is one of the two regions of* T *defined by* $\operatorname{proj}_T(B)$ *(as in the lipschitz approximation lemma) such that* $f(0) = 0$,

$$\operatorname{spt} V \cap B_{\gamma R}(0) = \operatorname{graph} f \cap B_{\gamma R}(0)$$

and

$$(\gamma R)^m \frac{|Df(x) - Df(y)|}{|x-y|^m} \leq cE^*(0,R,T)^{\frac{1}{2}} \text{ for all } x, y \in B^k_{\gamma R}(0) \cap \widetilde{H}$$

Proof. Fix $\gamma \in (0,1/32)$. We first show that the tilt excess decay theorem (Theorem 3.12) is applicable in the ball $B_{\gamma R}(b)$ for any $b \in B_{\gamma R}(0) \cap B$.

We note that

$$E(b, \gamma R, T) \leq \gamma^{-k} E(0,R,T) \Rightarrow E_*(b, \gamma R, T) \leq \gamma^{-k}\varepsilon$$

for any $b \in B_{\gamma R}(0) \cap B$.

Let $T_b = T_b B + \{0\}^{k-1} \times \mathbb{R} \times \{0\}^{n-k}$. Then, by 1.1,

$$|\operatorname{proj}_{T_b} - \operatorname{proj}_T|^2 \leq c\varepsilon E_* \tag{1}$$

where c depends only on n, k and hence

$$\begin{aligned} E_*(b, \gamma R, T_b) \leq & E_*(b, \gamma R, T) + \frac{1}{(\gamma R)^k} \int_{B_{\gamma R}(b)} |\operatorname{proj}_{T_b} - \operatorname{proj}_T|^2 d\mu_V \\ \leq & c\gamma^{-k} E_*(0,R,T). \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

Claim: For any $\delta_1 > 0$, there exist ε, δ small enough so that for any $b \in B_{\gamma R}(0) \cap B$:

$$(\sigma R)^{-k} \omega_k^{-1} \mu_V(B_{\sigma R}(b)) \leq \frac{1+\delta_1}{2}\,, \forall \sigma \leq \gamma. \tag{3}$$

Proof of claim: Note that by the monotonicity inequality (1) of Lemma 2.9 we have that

$$(\sigma R)^{-k} \omega_k^{-1} \mu_V(B_{\sigma R}(b)) \leq (1 + c\varepsilon)(\gamma R)^{-k} \omega_k^{-1} \mu_V(B_{\gamma R}(b))$$

and hence it is enough to prove the claim for $\sigma = \gamma$.

Given $l, \eta \in (0,1)$ let δ, ε be small enough so that the Lemma 3.4 and Lemma 3.9 hold in the ball $B_{2\gamma R}(0)$. In particular

$$\Theta_V(x) \leq 1 + \eta\,, \forall x \in B_{2\gamma R}(0) \cap \operatorname{spt} V$$

and there exists a Lipschitz function

$$f : \widetilde{H} \cap B^k_{2\gamma R}(0) \to \mathbb{R}^{n-k} \tag{4}$$

with $\operatorname{Lip} f \leq l$ and such that

$$\mathcal{H}^k\left(\left((\operatorname{graph} f \setminus \operatorname{spt} V) \cup (\operatorname{spt} V \setminus \operatorname{graph} f)\right) \cap B_{2\gamma R}(0)\right) \leq cl^{-2} E^* R^k.$$

By Remark 3.10 we have that

$$(B_{2\gamma R}(0) \cap \operatorname{spt} V) \setminus T_{cE^{1/2k} R} \subset \operatorname{graph} f \tag{5}$$

where recall that

$$T_\rho = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \rho(x) \leq \rho\}.$$

Therefore, by the area formula for the function $F(x) = (x, f(x))$ and using the fact that $J(F) \leq \sqrt{1+cl^2}$, $\theta(x) \leq 1+\eta$ as well as 1.1 we have that for $b \in B_{\gamma R}(0)$

$$\mu_V(B_{\gamma R}(b) \setminus T_{cE^{1/2k}R}) \leq (1+\eta)\sqrt{1+cl^2}\,(1+\varepsilon)\,\frac{\gamma^k R^k}{2}\omega_k.$$

By the tubular monotonicity inequality (17) in the proof of Lemma 2.1, we have that

$$\mu_V(B_{\gamma R}(b) \cap T_{cE^{1/2k}R}) \leq cE^{1/2k}(\gamma R)^k \omega_k$$

Hence

$$\omega_k^{-1}(\gamma R)^{-k}\mu_V(B_{\gamma R}(b)) \leq \frac{1}{2}(1+\eta)\sqrt{1+cl^2}(1+\varepsilon) + cE^{1/2k} \leq \frac{1+\delta_1}{2} \tag{6}$$

provided that l, η, ε are small enough. In particular we first pick ε small enough so that $c\varepsilon^{1/2k} \leq \delta_1/4$, then pick l so that for small enough ε, η

$$\frac{1}{2}(1+\eta)\sqrt{1+cl^2}(1+\varepsilon) \leq 1/2 + \delta_1/4$$

where c in both inequalities is as in (6). Hence the claim is true.

Because of (2), (3) we can apply the the tilt excess decay theorem (Theorem 3.12) in $B_{\gamma R}(b)$ for any $b \in B_{\gamma R}(0)$ and with T replaced by T_b. Hence using the notation

$$m = \min\left\{\alpha, \left(1 - \frac{k}{p}\right)\right\}$$

we get that for ε, δ small enough there exists $\theta \in (0,1)$ such that

$$E_*(b, \theta\gamma R, S_1) \leq \theta^{2m} E_*(b, \gamma R, T_b) \leq c\theta^{2m} E_*(0, R, T) \tag{7}$$

for some k-dimensional subspace S_1, depending on b, with $T_b B \subset S_1$ (note that the last inequality follows by (2)).

Because of (7), (3) we can apply again the the tilt excess decay theorem in $B_{\theta\gamma R}(b)$ and by induction we get k-dimensional subspaces $S_1, S_2, \ldots$ all of which contain $T_b B$ and such that

$$\begin{aligned} E_*(b, \theta^j\gamma R, S_j) &\leq \theta^{2m} E_*(b, \theta^{j-1}\gamma R, S_{j-1}) \\ &\leq \theta^{2jm} E_*(b, \gamma R, T^b) \leq c\theta^{2jm} E_*(0, R, T). \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

Using the monotonicity at the boundary (cf. (1) in Lemma 2.9) we have that

$$\begin{aligned} |\operatorname{proj}_{S_j} - \operatorname{proj}_{S_{j-1}}|^2 &\leq c\left(E(b, \theta^j\gamma R, S_j) + E(b, \theta^{j-1}\gamma R, S_{j-1})\right) \\ &\leq c\theta^{2(j-1)m} E_*(0, R, T). \end{aligned}$$

Hence for $i > j$

$$|\operatorname{proj}_{S_i} - \operatorname{proj}_{S_j}|^2 \leq c\theta^{2jm} E_*(0, R, T) \tag{9}$$

and thus the subspaces S_j converge to a k-dimensional subspace $S(b)$, for which $T_b B \subset S(b)$ and

$$|\operatorname{proj}_{S(b)} - \operatorname{proj}_{S_j}|^2 \leq c\theta^{2jm} E_*(0, R, T) \quad \forall j \geq 0. \tag{10}$$

For $j = 0$, the above inequality yields

$$|\operatorname{proj}_{S(b)} - \operatorname{proj}_{T_b}|^2 \leq cE_*(0, R, T). \tag{11}$$

For any $\sigma \leq \gamma R$ we can pick $j \geq 0$ such that $\theta^{j+1}\gamma R < \sigma \leq \theta^j \gamma R$. Then by (8), (10) and the monotonicity formula at the boundary, (2) in Lemma 2.9, we have

$$E(b,\sigma,S(b)) \leq c\theta^{2(j+1)m} E_*(0,R,T) \leq c\left(\frac{\sigma}{\gamma R}\right)^{2m} E_*(0,R,T) \tag{12}$$

and by (11) we furthermore have

$$E_*(b,\sigma,T_b) \leq c\varepsilon. \tag{13}$$

We claim that $\operatorname{spt} V \cap B_{\gamma R/2}(0) \subset \operatorname{graph} f$, where f is the Lipschitz function defined in (4).

Because of (5), we only need to show that

$$\operatorname{spt} V \cap T_{cE^{1/2k}R} \cap B_{\gamma R/2}(0) \subset \operatorname{graph} f.$$

Let $\rho = cE^{1/2k}R$ and let ε be small enough so that $4\rho < \gamma R$. Let $x \in \operatorname{spt} V \cap B_{\gamma R/2} \cap T_\rho$ and let $\bar{x} \in B \cap B_{\gamma R}(0)$ be such that $|x - \bar{x}| = \rho(x)$. Then by (12)

$$E(x,\rho(x)/2,S(\bar{x})) \leq 4^k E(\bar{x},2\rho(x),S(\bar{x})) \leq c\varepsilon.$$

Using this, the interior monotonicity [Sim83, 17.6] and Lemma 3.4 (ii) we have that

$$\begin{aligned} |\operatorname{proj}_{\chi(x)} - \operatorname{proj}_{S(\bar{x})}|^2 &\leq (1-c\varepsilon)^{-1}\left(E(x,\rho(x)/2,S(\bar{x})) + E(x,\rho(x)/2,\chi(x))\right) \\ &\leq c(\varepsilon + \eta^2). \end{aligned}$$

Hence by the above estimate, (11) and (1) we get

$$\|\operatorname{proj}_{\chi(x)} - \operatorname{proj}_T\|^2 \leq c(\eta^2 + \varepsilon). \tag{14}$$

Picking ε small enough so that Lemma 3.4 holds with η such that $(c(\eta^2+\varepsilon))^{1/2} < 2\eta(l) = l/20$ (with c as in (14)) we have that

$$\operatorname{spt} V \cap B_{\gamma R/2}(0) \cap T_\rho \subset G \Rightarrow \operatorname{spt} V \cap B_{\gamma R/2}(0) \cap T_\rho \subset \operatorname{graph} f$$

where G is the set constructed in (3) of the proof of Lemma 3.9.

We also claim that the inverse is true, i.e.

$$\operatorname{graph} f \cap B_{\gamma R/2}(0) \subset \operatorname{spt} V.$$

Assume it is not true. Then we could find a point $(z, f(z)) \in (\operatorname{graph} f \cap B_{\gamma R/2}(0)) \setminus \operatorname{spt} V$ and $\sigma > 0$ such that

$$(B^k_\sigma(z) \times \mathbb{R}^{n-k}) \cap B_{\gamma R/2}(0) \cap \operatorname{spt} V = \emptyset$$

and

$$(\overline{B}^k_\sigma(z) \times \mathbb{R}^{n-k}) \cap B_{\gamma R/2}(0) \cap \operatorname{spt} V \neq \emptyset.$$

Let $Y = (y, f(y)) \in (\overline{B}^k_\sigma(z) \times \mathbb{R}^{n-k}) \cap B_{\gamma R/2}(0) \cap \operatorname{spt} V$, then

$$\omega_k \Theta_V(Y) = \lim_{r\to 0} r^{-k} \int_{B_r(Y)} d\mu_V = \lim_{r\to 0} r^{-k} \int_{B_r(Y)} \theta(x) d\mathcal{H}^k(x)$$

and because $\operatorname{spt} V \cap B_{\gamma R/2}(0) \subset \operatorname{graph} f$ we can estimate $\Theta_V(Y)$ by using the area formula for the function $F(x) = (x, f(x))$:

$$\int_{B_r(Y)} \theta(x) d\mathcal{H}^k(x) = \int_{B^k_r(y)\cap\widetilde{H}} \theta \circ F(x) JF d\mathcal{H}^k(x).$$

Since $\theta \circ F(x) = 0$ for $x \in B^k_r(y) \cap B^k_\sigma(z)$ we have that

$$\Theta_V(Y) < 1$$

and in the special case when $(y, f(y)) \in \operatorname{spt} V \cap B$, we similarly get

$$\Theta_V(Y) < 1/2$$

which in both cases is a contradiction (cf. Corollary 2.8).

Hence

$$\operatorname{graph} f \cap B_{\gamma R/2}(0) = \operatorname{spt} V \cap B_{\gamma R/2}(0). \tag{15}$$

For the subspace $S(b)$ as constructed above, let

$$\ell_b : (\ell_b^1, \dots, \ell_b^{n-k}) : \mathbb{R}^k \to \mathbb{R}^{n-k}$$

be the linear function such that $\operatorname{graph} \ell_b = S(b)$.

For any $b \in B \cap B_{\gamma R/2}(0) \cap \operatorname{spt} V$ we have that $b = (b', f(b'))$ for some $b' \in \partial \widetilde{H} \cap B^k_{\gamma R/2}(0)$. Let $0 < \sigma \leq \gamma R/2$ be such that $B_\sigma(b) \subset B_{\gamma R/2}(0)$. Using the area formula along with the fact that $1 \leq JF \leq \sqrt{1 + c|Df|^2}$, $\theta(x) \geq 1$ for μ_V-almost every $x \in \operatorname{spt} V$ as well as (12), we get that

$$\begin{aligned}(\sigma/2)^{-k} \int_{\widetilde{H} \cap B^k_{\sigma/2}(b')} \sum_{i=1}^{n-k} |Df^i - D\ell_b^i|^2 d\mathcal{H}^k &\leq cE(b, \sigma, S(b)) \\ &\leq c \left(\frac{\sigma}{\gamma R}\right)^{2m} E_*(0, R, T).\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

Since $\Theta_V(b) \geq 1/2$ (Corollary 2.8), letting $\sigma \to 0$, we have that

$$Df^i(\operatorname{proj}_T(b)) = D\ell_b^i \tag{17}$$

for all $i = 1, \dots, n-k$.

Let $x \in (\operatorname{spt} V \setminus B) \cap B_{\gamma R/2}(0)$ and let $\bar{x} \in \operatorname{spt} V \cap B \cap B_{\gamma R}$ be such that $|x - \bar{x}| = \rho(x)$. Then, using (12)

$$\begin{gathered}E(x, \rho(x), S(\bar{x})) \leq 2^k E(\bar{x}, 2\rho(x), S(\bar{x})) \Rightarrow \\ E_*(x, \rho(x), S(\bar{x})) \leq c \left(\frac{\rho(x)}{\gamma R}\right)^{2m} E_*(0, R, T).\end{gathered}$$

Furthermore, since $\operatorname{spt} V \cap B_\sigma(x) \subset \operatorname{graph} f$ for $\sigma \leq \rho(x)$, by the area formula and Lemma 3.4 we can estimate:

$$\omega_k^{-1} \sigma^{-k} \mu_V(B_\sigma(x)) \leq (1 + \eta)\sqrt{1 + cl^2}\ , \ \forall \sigma \leq \rho(x).$$

Hence we can apply the tilt excess decay lemma for the interior [Sim83, 22.5] in the ball $B_{\rho(x)}(x)$ and arguing as in (8)-(12) we conclude that there exists a k-dimensional subspace $S(x)$ such that for all $\sigma < \rho(x)$

$$\begin{aligned}E_*(x, \sigma, S(x)) &\leq c \left(\frac{\sigma}{\rho(x)}\right)^{2m} E_*(x, \rho(x), S(\bar{x})) \Rightarrow \\ E_*(x, \sigma, S(x)) &\leq c \left(\frac{\sigma}{\gamma R}\right)^{2m} E_*(0, R, T).\end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

Letting as before

$$\ell_x : (\ell_x^1, \dots, \ell_x^{n-k}) : \mathbb{R}^k \to \mathbb{R}^{n-k}$$

to be the linear function such that $\operatorname{graph} \ell_x = S(x)$, we can argue as in the case of a boundary point (cf. (16)) to conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}(\sigma/2)^{-k} \int_{\widetilde{H} \cap B^k_{\sigma/2}(x)} \sum_{i=1}^{n-k} |Df^i - D\ell^i_x|^2 d\mathcal{H}^k &\le cE(x,\sigma,S(x)) \\ &\le c\left(\frac{\sigma}{\gamma R}\right)^{2m} E_*(0,R,T)\end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

and letting $\sigma \to 0$ we have

$$Df^i(\operatorname{proj}_T(x)) = D\ell^i_x \tag{20}$$

for $x \in (\operatorname{spt} V \setminus B) \cap B_{\gamma R/2}(0)$ and all $i = 1, \ldots, n-k$.

Now let $x, y \in \widetilde{H} \cap B^k_{\gamma R/4}(0)$ and let $X, Y \in \operatorname{spt} V \cap B_{\gamma R/2}(0)$ be such that $X = (x, f(x))$ and $Y = (y, f(y))$. We will show that for all $j = 1, 2, \ldots, n-k$

$$|Df^j(x) - Df^j(y)| \le c\left(\frac{|x-y|}{\gamma R}\right)^m E^*(0,R,T)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{21}$$

Let $r = |x-y|$ and $r' = |X-Y|$. Note that $r, r' \le \gamma R$ and

$$r^2 \le r'^2 \le (1+l^2)r^2 \le 2r^2.$$

Case 1:$X, Y \in B \Rightarrow x, y \in \partial\widetilde{H}$.
Using (17) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=1}^{n-k} |Df^i(x) - Df^i(y)|^2 \le{}& cr^{-k} \int_{\widetilde{H} \cap B^k_r(x)} \sum_{i=1}^{n-k} |D\ell^i_x - Df^i(z)|^2 d\mathcal{H}^k(z) \\ &+ c(2r)^{-k} \int_{\widetilde{H} \cap B^k_{2r}(y)} \sum_{i=1}^{n-k} |D\ell^i_y - Df^i(z)|^2 d\mathcal{H}^k(z)\end{aligned}$$

and by (16)

$$|Df^i(x) - Df^i(y)| \le c\left(\frac{|x-y|}{\gamma R}\right)^m E_*(0,R,T)^{\frac{1}{2}} \tag{22}$$

for all $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n-k$.
Case 2: $X \in B$, $Y \notin B$.

For $Y = (y, f(y))$, let $Y_0 = (y_0, f(y_0)) \in B$ be such that $\rho(Y) = |Y - Y_0|$ and y_0 such that $Y_0 = (y_0, f(y_0))$. Using (17) and (20) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=1}^{n-k} |Df^i(y_0) - Df^i(y)|^2 \le{}& c|y-y_0|^{-k} \int_{\widetilde{H} \cap B^k_{|y-y_0|}(y)} \sum_{i=1}^{n-k} |D\ell^i_y - Df^i(z)|^2 d\mathcal{H}^k(z) \\ &+ c(2|y-y_0|)^{-k} \int_{\widetilde{H} \cap B^k_{2|y-y_0|}(y_0)} \sum_{i=1}^{n-k} |Df^i(z) - D\ell^i_{y_0}|^2 d\mathcal{H}^k(z)\end{aligned}$$

hence by (16), (19)

$$|Df^i(y_0) - Df^i(y)| \le c\left(\frac{|y-y_0|}{\gamma R}\right)^m E_*(0,R,T)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Also from (22) in Case 1 we have that

$$|Df^i(y_0) - Df^i(x)| \leq c\left(\frac{|x-y_0|}{\gamma R}\right)^m E_*(0,R,T)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Hence, since $|x-y_0| \leq |x-y| + |y-y_0|$ and $|y-y_0| \leq |y-x|$ we have that

$$|Df^i(x) - Df^i(y)| \leq c\left(\frac{|x-y|}{\gamma R}\right)^m E_*(0,R,T)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

for all $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n-k$.
Case 3: $X, Y \notin B$.
Let $X_0 = (x_0, f(x_0)), Y_0 = (y_0, f(y_0)) \in B$ be such that $|X - X_0| = \rho(X)$ and $|Y - Y_0| = \rho(Y)$.

Case 3 (i): $\min\{|x-x_0|, |y-y_0|\} > 2|x-y|$.
Using (20) we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n-k} |Df^i(x) - Df^i(y)|^2 \leq cr^{-k} \int_{B_r^k(x)} \sum_{i=1}^{n-k} |D\ell_x^i - Df^i(z)|^2 d\mathcal{H}^k(z)$$
$$+ c(2r)^{-k} \int_{B_{2r}^k(y)} \sum_{i=1}^{n-k} |D\ell_y^i - Df^i(z)|^2 d\mathcal{H}^k(z)$$

and by (19)

$$|Df^i(x) - Df^i(y)| \leq c\left(\frac{|x-y|}{\gamma R}\right)^m E_*(0,R,T)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

Case 3 (ii): $\min\{|x-x_0|, |y-y_0|\} \leq 2|x-y|$.
Then by Cases 1 and 2 we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
|Df^i(x_0) - Df^i(y_0)| &\leq c\left(\frac{|x_0-y_0|}{\gamma R}\right)^m E_*(0,R,T)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
|Df^i(x) - Df^i(x_0)| &\leq c\left(\frac{|x-x_0|}{\gamma R}\right)^m E_*(0,R,T)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
|Df^i(y) - Df^i(y_0)| &\leq c\left(\frac{|y-y_0|}{\gamma R}\right)^m E_*(0,R,T)^{\frac{1}{2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $|x_0 - y_0| \leq c|x-y|$ and without loss of generality we can assume that $|x-x_0| \leq 2|x-y|$. Then we also have $|y-y_0| \leq |x-y| + |x-x_0| + |x_0-y_0| \leq c|x-y|$. Hence

$$|Df^i(x) - Df^i(y)| \leq c\left(\frac{|x-y|}{\gamma R}\right)^m E_*(0,R,T)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

for all $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n-k$.

Hence f is a $C^{1,m}$ function with $f(0) = 0$ and so the theorem is true. □

The regularity theorem still holds without the assumption $E_*(0,R,T) \leq \varepsilon$. In particular we have the following.

Theorem 3.14. *We assume that*

$$a = R^{1-k/p}\|H\|_{L^p(B_R(0))} \leq \delta \ , \ \kappa R^\alpha \leq \delta$$

and

$$R^{-k}\mu_V(B_R(0)) \leq \frac{1+\delta}{2}.$$

Then for any $\gamma \in (0, 1/32)$ there exists δ such that under the above hypotheses there exists a linear isometry q and a $C^{1,m}$ function $f : \widetilde{H} \cap B_{\gamma R}(0) \to \mathbb{R}^{n-k}$ with $m = \min\{\alpha, 1 - k/p\}$ and $\widetilde{H}$ a $C^{1,\alpha}$ domain such that $0 \in \partial\widetilde{H}$, such that $f(0) = 0$,

$$\operatorname{spt} V \cap B_{\gamma R}(0) = q(\operatorname{graph} f) \cap B_{\gamma_R}(0)$$

and

$$(\gamma R)^m \frac{|Df(x) - Df(y)|}{|x-y|^m} \leq c\eta^{\frac{1}{4k}} \text{ for all } x, y \in B_{\gamma R}(0)$$

where $\eta = \eta(\delta)$ is as in Theorem 3.4.

Proof. We will prove that given $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ we can take δ small enough so that for a k-dimensional subspace T such that $T_0 B = T' \subset T$, $E(0, \gamma R, T) \leq \eta^{1/2k}$. Then the theorem will be an immediate consequence of Theorem 3.13 with $\varepsilon = \eta^{1/2k}$.

Given $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, take δ small enough so that the interior regularity theorem, Theorem 3.4, holds in $B_{\gamma R}(0)$ for some $\eta \in (0, 1)$.

For $\sigma \leq 1 - \gamma$, let $\mathcal{O} = \{B_{\sigma R/5}(x)\}$ be a collection of disjoint balls of radii $\sigma R/5$ and with centers in $\operatorname{spt} V \cap B_{\gamma R}(0) \setminus T_{\sigma R}$. For any ball in $\mathcal{O}$ we have that $B_{\sigma R}(x) \subset B_R(0) \setminus B$ so by the interior monotonicity [Sim83, 17.6] we get that

$$\omega_k^{-1}(\sigma R/5)^{-k} \mu_V(B_{\sigma R/5}(x)) \geq (1 + c\delta)^{-1}.$$

Hence for N distinct balls in $\mathcal{O}$, we have that

$$cN\sigma^k \leq \frac{1+\delta}{2} \Rightarrow N \leq c\sigma^{-k}.$$

Taking $\mathcal{O}$ to be maximal we also have that

$$(\operatorname{spt} V \cap B_{\gamma R}(0)) \setminus T_{\sigma R} \subset \bigcup_{B_{\sigma R/5}(x) \in \mathcal{O}} B_{\sigma R}(x).$$

For any $x \in \operatorname{spt} V \setminus T_{\sigma R}$, by Theorem 3.4, we have that

$$\| \operatorname{proj}_{T_y M} - \operatorname{proj}_{T_z M} \| \leq c\eta \quad \forall y, z \in B_{\sigma R}(x).$$

Let now $y, z \in B_{\gamma R}(0) \setminus T_{\sigma R}$. Joining y, z with balls of the form $B_{\sigma R}(x)$ such that $B_{\sigma R/5}(x) \in \mathcal{O}$, we get that

$$\| \operatorname{proj}_{T_y M} - \operatorname{proj}_{T_z M} \| \leq cN\eta \leq c\sigma^{-k}\eta \quad \forall y, z \in B_{\gamma R}(0) \setminus T_{\sigma R}.$$

By the tubular monotonicity inequality, (17) in the proof of Lemma 2.1, we get

$$\mu_V(B_{\gamma R}(0) \cap T_{\sigma R}) \leq c\sigma R^k.$$

Hence picking $T = \chi(x)$, for any $x \in B_{\gamma R}(0) \setminus T_{\sigma R}$ we have that

$$E(0, \gamma R, T) \leq c\left(\sigma^{-2k}\eta^2 + \sigma\right)$$

so picking $\sigma = \eta^{1/2k}$ we have that

$$E(0, \gamma R, T) \leq c\eta^{1/2k}.$$

□

4. ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I would like to thank Professor Leon Simon, for all his help and advise.

References

[All72] William K. Allard, *On the first variation of a varifold*, Ann. of Math. (2) **95** (1972), 417–491. MR MR0307015 (46 #6136)

[All75] ______, *On the first variation of a varifold: boundary behavior*, Ann. of Math. (2) **101** (1975), 418–446. MR MR0397520 (53 #1379)

[Bro77] John E. Brothers, *Existence and structure of tangent cones at the boundary of an area minimizing integral current*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **26** (1977), no. 6, 1027–1044. MR MR0487727 (58 #7342)

[DS93a] Frank Duzaar and Klaus Steffen, *Boundary regularity for minimizing currents with prescribed mean curvature*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **1** (1993), no. 4, 355–406. MR MR1383909 (97e:49036)

[DS93b] ______, λ *minimizing currents*, Manuscripta Math. **80** (1993), no. 4, 403–447. MR MR1243155 (95f:49062)

[HS79] Robert Hardt and Leon Simon, *Boundary regularity and embedded solutions for the oriented Plateau problem*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.) **1** (1979), no. 1, 263–265. MR MR513755 (81b:53012)

[KP99] Steven G. Krantz and Harold R. Parks, *The geometry of domains in space*, Birkhäuser Advanced Texts: Basler Lehrbücher. [Birkhäuser Advanced Texts: Basel Textbooks], Birkhäuser Boston Inc., Boston, MA, 1999. MR MR1730695 (2000m:28005)

[Sim83] Leon Simon, *Lectures on geometric measure theory*, Proceedings of the Centre for Mathematical Analysis, Australian National University, vol. 3, Australian National University Centre for Mathematical Analysis, Canberra, 1983. MR MR756417 (87a:49001)